Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

BX 5133 .J29 B4 1830
James, William.
The benefit and necessity o
the Christian sacraments

Number

WORKS

JUST READY FOR PUBLICATION

BY

J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

The LIFE of RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.
Master of Trinity College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. With an Account of his Writings, and Anecdotes of many distinguished Characters during the Period in which he flourished.

By the Right Rev. JAMES HENRY MONK, D.D.
Lord Bishop of Gloucester.

SECOND EDITION, 2 Vols. 8vo. *Portrait.*

(In a few days.)

II.

DISSERTATIONS vindicating the CHURCH of ENGLAND with regard to some essential Points of POLITY and DOCTRINE.

By JOHN SINCLAIR, M.A. F.R.S.E.
Of Pembroke College, Oxford; and Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, Edinburgh.

8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

III.

SEVEN LETTERS on NATIONAL RELIGION.
Addressed to the Rev. HENRY MELVILL, A.M., late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

CONTENTS: I. On the Principle of National Religion.—II. Exemplified in the Gentile State of Britain.—III. The Effect of the Apostolical Accession of the Church of Christ.—IV. The Operation of the Papacy.—V. The Principle of Protestantism with respect to the Papacy.—VI. The Principle of Protestantism with respect to Dissent.—VII. These Subjects in connection with the present Crisis.

By CHARLES SMITH, B.D.
Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

IV.

NUMBER I.

(To be completed in Twelve Monthly Parts) price 2s. each, of

The HOLY BIBLE,

Arranged in HISTORICAL and CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER,

In such manner that the whole may be read AS ONE CONNECTED HISTORY, in the Words of the Authorized Translation. With short Notes; and a Table, dividing the Sacred Volume into 365 Portions, for daily reading throughout the Year.

By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, M.A.
Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton.

NEW EDITION, TO FORM ONE LARGE VOLUME.

The larger Edition of the ARRANGEMENT, *containing a copious Body of Annotations, may be had in four volumes, price £4 in boards, or the* OLD *and* NEW TESTAMENT *separately, price £2 each.*

V.

THE SECOND VOLUME OF

PLAIN PAROCHIAL SERMONS, preached in the Parish Church of BOLTON-LE-MOORS.

By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A.
Vicar of Bolton, and Prebendary of Chester.
12mo. 6*s.*

Also lately published, the SECOND EDITION *of the* FIRST VOLUME. 6*s.*

VI.

The HAPPINESS of the BLESSED,

Considered as to the Particulars of their State; their Recognition of each other in that State; and its Difference of Degrees. To which are added, Musings on the Church and her Services.

By RICHARD MANT, D.D.
Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.
12mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

VII.

A MEMOIR of FELIX NEFF, PASTOR of the HIGH ALPS; and of his Labours among the French Protestants of Dauphiné, a Remnant of the Primitive Christians of Gaul.

By W. S. GILLY, M.A.
Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Norham.

"That they were not exterminated is owing, under Divine Providence, to the almost inaccessible nature of the country. Dormilleuse, and most of the villages of Val Frossiniere, are exposed to frequent avalanches: but to these, in part, may be ascribed their religious existence."—*Journal of Neff.*

SECOND EDITION, Small 8vo. *(Nearly ready.)*

VIII.

DEVOTIONAL EXTRACTS,

For every Day in the Year. Compiled from various Authors.

In 2 Vols. 12mo. 12*s.*

IX.

The SECOND PART of the Rev. C. GIRDLESTONE'S COMMENTARY on the NEW TESTAMENT, containing the GOSPELS of ST. LUKE and ST. JOHN.

8vo. 9*s*.

Lately published, the SECOND EDITION *of the* FIRST PART, *containing* ST. MATTHEW *and* ST. MARK, *price* 9*s*.

X.

THE THIRD EDITION OF

SEVEN SERMONS on the COURSE of CHRISTIAN LIFE.

By the Rev. CHARLES GIRDLESTONE, M.A.
Vicar of Sedgley, Staffordshire.

12mo. *(Nearly ready.)*

XI.

The GOSPEL, an ABIDING SYSTEM.

With some Remarks on the "New Christianity" of the St. Simonians. Being the Christian Advocate's Publication for the Year 1832.

By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.
Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge.

8vo. 4*s*. 6*d*.

XII.

SERMONS,

By the Rev. HENRY STEBBING, M.A.
Alternate Morning Preacher at St. James's Chapel, Hampstead Road.

12mo. 6*s*. 6*d*.

XIII.

The INVALID'S HELP to PRAYER and MEDITATION;

Containing a variety of Prayers adapted to all Conditions of Men; With Directions for proper Reading, and other Helps to Devotion, forming a complete Manual for a Sick Room.
Also, Prayers in behalf, and on the Loss of Friends.

By the Rev. E. P. HANNAM, M.A.
Author of "The Hospital Manual," and Curate of the New Church, St. Pancras, Middlesex.

12mo. 2*s*.

XIV.

An INVESTIGATION of the CURRENTS of the ATLANTIC OCEAN, and of those which prevail between the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic.

By the late Major JAMES RENNELL, F.R.S. Lond. and Edinb. formerly Surveyor-General of Bengal.

With an ATLAS *of* CHARTS, £3. 3*s*.

XV.

THE SECOND EDITION OF

TWENTY PAROCHIAL SERMONS.

With an APPENDIX, containing Parochial Papers.

By the Rev. CHARLES GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

Vicar of Sedgley, Staffordshire.

12mo. 5*s*.

Also, by the same Author,

TWENTY PAROCHIAL SERMONS.—*SECOND SERIES.*

Adapted to the use of FAMILIES. With an APPENDIX, containing Family Prayers.

The Family Prayers are sold separately, price 4d.

XVI.

SEVEN SERMONS preached during the Prevalence of CHOLERA in the Parish of SEDGLEY: together with a Narrative of this awful Visitation, and of the Religious Impression produced in the South of Stafford Mining District.

By the Rev. CHARLES GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

Vicar of Sedgley, Staffordshire.

12mo. *(Nearly ready.)*

XVII.

GENEALOGICAL CHART of the KINGS of ENGLAND, from the Norman Conquest to 1832.

In Case, 10s., *or mounted on Rollers,* 15*s*.

XVIII.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS on CHURCH REFORM and on the Principles of Church Legislation.

By the Rev. F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A.

Of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Rector of Ormsby, Lincolnshire.

Small 8vo. *(Nearly ready.)*

XIX.

SERMONS.

By THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D.

Head Master of Rugby School, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

THIRD EDITION. 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

XX.

THE SECOND VOLUME OF

THE BIBLICAL CABINET;

Containing a Collection of PHILOLOGICAL TRACTS on the NEW TESTAMENT, &c. by PFANNKUCHE, PLANCK, THOLUCK, and BECKHAUS.

Small 8vo. 5*s*.

XXI.

ADVICE to a YOUNG MAN on his first going to OXFORD.

In TEN LETTERS, from an Uncle to his Nephew. 12mo. 3*s.*

By the Rev. EDWARD BERENS, M.A.
Late Fellow of Oriel College.

XXII.

The GOSPEL MIRACLES;

In a Series of Poetical Sketches, with illustrative Conversations.

By RICHARD MANT, D.D. M.R.I.A.
Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.

12mo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

XXIII.

EXPLANATORY LECTURES on the Gospel of ST. MATTHEW.

By the Rev. JOHN PENROSE, M.A.
Of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

12mo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

XXIV.

A MANUAL for the PARISH PRIEST;

Being a few Hints on the Pastoral Care to the Younger Clergy of the Church of England: from an ELDER BROTHER. FOURTH EDITION.

12mo. 3*s.*

XXV.

HISTORY of the REFORMED RELIGION in FRANCE.

By EDWARD SMEDLEY, M.A.
Late Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Vol. I. *With Portraits.* 6*s.*
Being the Third Volume of the THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

XXVI.

The APOSTOLICITY of TRINITARIANISM:

or the Testimony of History to the Positive Antiquity and Apostolical Inculcation of the DOCTRINE of the HOLY TRINITY.

By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D.
Rector of Long Newton.

In the FIRST BOOK the Author traces up the DOCTRINE of the HOLY TRINITY to the Apostolic Age, in various, distinct, though perfectly harmonizing, lines of Evidence.

In the SECOND BOOK are noticed the Objections which affect the Historical Part of the Question.

In 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 6*s.*

IN THE COURSE OF PUBLICATION, IN UNIFORM VOLUMES,

PRICE 6s. EACH.

THE

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

DEDICATED, BY PERMISSION, TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

EDITORS.

The VEN. ARCHDEACON LYALL, M.A.

The REV. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.

THIS PUBLICATION WILL BE COMPRISED IN A LIMITED NUMBER OF VOLUMES, AND IS INTENDED TO FORM, WHEN COMPLETED, A DIGESTED SYSTEM OF RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL KNOWLEDGE.

VOLUMES PUBLISHED:

I.

The LIFE of WICLIF.

By the Rev. CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A.

Professor in the East India College, Herts; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

Portrait. 6s.

II.

The CONSISTENCY of the whole SCHEME of REVELATION with ITSELF and with HUMAN REASON.

By PHILIP NICHOLAS SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D.

Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts.

6s.

III.

HISTORY of the REFORMED RELIGION in FRANCE.

By EDWARD SMEDLEY, M.A.

Late Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Vol. I. *With Portraits.* 6s.

*** *Several New Volumes are in preparation.*

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

IN THE COURSE OF PUBLICATION, IN NUMBERS,

PRICE 6*d.* EACH.

THE

NEW TESTAMENT

OF

OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

WITH

A COMMENTARY,

CONSISTING OF

SHORT LECTURES FOR THE DAILY USE OF FAMILIES.

BY THE

REV. CHARLES GIRDLESTONE, M.A.
VICAR OF SEDGLEY, STAFFORDSHIRE.

In this edition of the New Testament, it has been the chief object of the Editor to furnish masters of families with an exposition for daily reading at the hour of domestic worship. With this view he has consulted the many excellent existing Commentaries on the Bible, and endeavoured to select from them the topics of most use for general edification. The Scripture is divided into paragraphs of a convenient length. And the explanatory and practical matter is digested, under each paragraph, into one consecutive lecture; so as to demand, of the reader, no previous pains and attention. This plan will, it is hoped, give additional facility to the reading and expounding of the sacred Volume, in many families where the masters have neither leisure nor ability to select what they might best read from more voluminous editions.

PART I. *containing the* GOSPELS *of* ST. MATTHEW *and* ST. MARK, *and* PART II. *containing* ST. LUKE *and* ST. JOHN, *may be had complete, price 9s. each, in boards.*

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

This day is Published, No. I. *(to be continued Monthly)*, *Price 4d.*

OF THE

COTTAGER'S MONTHLY VISITOR.

NEW SERIES.

This Miscellany, which has been published with increasing success during twelve years, is now offered to the Public at a reduced price, in the expectation of a still wider circulation, and to enable a much larger proportion of those Classes to which its pages are more particularly addressed to give the Monthly Visitor a welcome reception. Drawings of Scenery and Figures have been introduced into the latter Numbers of the Work, in order to give additional variety to its pages, and these Embellishments will be continued in each Number of the present Series. In reducing the price it has been found requisite to lessen the extent by a few pages; which is, however, compensated in a great degree by a more compressed mode of printing.

The Work will be continued under the same Editorial direction and upon the same principles as before, providing a copious Manual of Religious Instruction and Domestic Economy for the poorer Classes, and adapted likewise to the use of Servants and Households. The Volumes already published have been added to the List of Books recommended by the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, and will be found to contain numerous practical Illustrations of the Holy Scriptures; Familiar Letters on the History of England; useful Instructions in Gardening and Agriculture; together with a great variety of Miscellaneous Information.

*** *Any of the former Volumes for the Years* 1821 *to* 1832, *may be had in Boards, price* 6*s. each, or* 6*s.* 6*d. half-bound.*

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

The Rev.d T. Arnold.
With the Author's kind regards

THE SACRAMENTS

AND

THE SABBATH.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY GILBERT AND RIVINGTON,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

THE BENEFIT AND NECESSITY OF THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS,
AND THE PERPETUAL OBLIGATION OF THE MORAL LAW,
PARTICULARLY AS BINDING US TO KEEP
THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH,

CONSIDERED IN

FOUR SERMONS,

PREACHED BEFORE THE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD:

WITH AN APPENDIX,

ILLUSTRATING THE LAST OF THESE SUBJECTS, IN REMARKS ON
DR. HEYLYN'S HISTORY OF THE SABBATH.

BY
WILLIAM JAMES, M.A.
VICAR OF COBHAM, SURREY, AND FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL:
AND J. PARKER, OXFORD.

1830.

PREFACE.

In offering to the public the following Sermons on Religious Ordinances—most important, as they concern all members of the Church alike—the design of the author has been, to lay plainly before others the grounds of his own conviction, that the Church of England has most faithfully and correctly interpreted the doctrines of Scripture concerning them.

The doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, indeed, must needs be acknowledged by all who draw their opinions from the Bible, if only it be distinctly stated what is meant by the expression, and it be shewn, that such is our Saviour's meaning in his discourse with Nicodemus. To point out, therefore, why the application of John iii. 3,

to baptism, by Justin Martyr, confirmed as it is by the concurrent testimony of all the early Fathers, ought to be decisive of the true sense of that passage; how the passage itself, so interpreted, fits the occasion of the discourse; and further, how in all cases, even in that of infants, the grace of baptism, if the nature of the blessing be duly considered, may be seen to be truly described as "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," according to the Scriptural use of such expressions; to point out and to clear up these matters, it was hoped might give satisfaction to those, who have not leisure to follow up the enquiry for themselves. As to the other Sacrament, the Lord's Supper, the lamentable neglect of it by so many who profess and call themselves Christians, renders it unnecessary (since different minds may be struck by different modes of stating the truth) to apologize for adding one more to the numerous arguments, by which it has been attempted to persuade men to seek and to find, in this Sacrament, that spiritual

feeding on Christ, which he declared necessary to salvation. And it seemed not ill suited to the present times, by calling attention to the words of our catechism on the holy Communion, to set forth, in its true light, the difference between our Church and that of Rome; that we may not, on the one hand, take an exaggerated view of their errors; nor, on the other, lose sight of the broad line of demarcation between their doctrines and our own.

But of all the subjects herein examined, the complexion and character of the times chiefly call for a true statement of the obligation to keep the Christian Sabbath: for if the ordinary public worship of God be neglected, it is useless to invite men to the more solemn and mysterious acts of devotion; and it is not easy to see how the observance of the Lord's day can be maintained and secured throughout the land, unless we are to be taught, that this is a duty to which we are bound by the commandment—"Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day."

In the early part of the seventeenth century, the extravagant notions some Sabbatarian enthusiasts had built on this doctrine, caused the doctrine itself to be questioned; and a fear of countenancing their extravagance, seems to have had a sinister influence on the judgments that were then formed concerning it. Of the writers of that day, Dr. Peter Heylyn produced the most full and comprehensive Treatise on the subject; and as his well-earned literary fame may give an undue importance to his opinions here, it was thought serviceable to the cause of truth to endeavour to shew, how unworthy his History of the Sabbath is to be received with confidence as a guide on so important a question. And surely it is a question of the highest importance, whether the Christian Sabbath is to be kept holy in obedience to that supreme authority, which in such matters of conscience, can alone command universal submission.

The Sabbath has been truly called the great preservative of religion. To the care-

less even and negligent, it is a continually-recurring record and memorial of most solemn and sacred truths, "whereby they who cannot be drawn to hearken to that we teach, may, by only looking on that we do, in a manner, read whatsoever we believe:" but to them that employ it rightly, that remember to keep holy each Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath, as if its "light were sevenfold, as the light of seven days," pours a blessing on the whole week, and quickens and preserves the religious principles, which can alone give true life to all our conduct in our earthly affairs, and in these, as in their proper soil, spring forth and blossom, and bear their wonted fruit. "I do not write lightly or inconsiderately," said the Lord Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale to his children; "but by long and sound experience I have found, that the due observance of this day and of the duties of it, have been of singular comfort and advantage to me; and I doubt not but it will prove so to you. God Almighty is the Lord of our time, and lends it to us;

and as it is but just we should consecrate this part of that time to Him, so I have found, by a strict and diligent observation, that a due observance of the duty of this day, hath ever had joined to it a blessing upon the rest of my time; and the week that hath been so begun, hath been blessed and prosperous to me: and, on the other side, when I have been negligent of the duties of this day, the rest of the week hath been unsuccessful and unhappy to my own secular employments; so that I could easily make an estimate of my successes in my own secular employments the week following, by the manner of my passing of this day." The author is unwilling, by adding one word, to weaken the impression that may be made by this deliberate declaration of one of the best of Christians and wisest of men.

Cobham, Vicarage,
Nov. 25, 1830.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
REC. NOV 1880
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

REGENERATION
THE SPIRITUAL GRACE OF BAPTISM.

JOHN iii. 5.

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God

PAGE

REASON why Justin Martyr's interpretation of the text is decisive of its true meaning—Why it would be so understood by Nicodemus—This meaning shewn to suit the occasion and the context—and to declare to Nicodemus the necessity of a change of heart—This change always accompanies regeneration in adult converts—yet infants also said to be regenerate in the primitive Church—The change, therefore, not essential to regeneration—nor so considered in our Church Catechism—Regeneration defined—The first Epistle of St. John not at variance with this definition—Scriptural mode of reclaiming careless Members of the Church, not by telling them that they are not regenerate, but that they are 1

[*St. Mary's, Oxford, Nov.* 8, 1829.]

SERMON II.

THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST THE SPIRITUAL GRACE OF THE EUCHARIST.

JOHN vi. 53, 54.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

PAGE

The correct interpretation of the text—confirmed by the opinion of Cranmer—The application of it to the Sacrament of the Eucharist—Different opinions of different Churches on this Sacrament—Lutheran and Roman opinions inconsistent with Scripture—The strong expressions of the early Fathers explained—Their doctrine and that of the Church of England essentially the same—Spiritual communion not confined to this Sacrament—Mistaken views of the sect called Quakers—Universal obligation to receive the Eucharist—Benefits of it—State of mind necessary to all communicants 33

[*St. Mary's, Oxford, Feb.* 7, 1830.]

SERMON III.

IN WHAT RESPECTS THE LAW IS ABOLISHED.

GAL. i. 23.

He which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the faith he once destroyed.

The peculiar circumstances of St. Paul's conversion, and, as connected with these, his election to declare in what respects the law is abolished—The prejudices of the Jews, and even of the first Christians on this subject—Hence the peculiar fit-

PAGE

ness of St. Paul for the office—His teaching and that of Christ the same—From Epist. Heb. we learn the abolition of ceremonial law—From Rom. and Gal. that of ceremonial and moral law as means of justification—From Eph. that of ceremonial and civil law—The law only so far abolished as itself shewed it should be—Error of John Agricola, founder of Antinomians—Moral law of perpetual force—The Decalogue considered, except the fourth commandment 57

Preached on the Festival of St. Paul's Conversion.

[*St. Mary's, Oxford, Jan.* 25, 1829.]

SERMON IV.

THE LORD'S DAY
THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

GEN. ii. 2, 3.

On the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work, which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.

The seventh day kept holy from the creation—This then no transitory rite of Moses' law—nature of the duty of keeping a Sabbath—This duty equally fulfilled by keeping the first day of the week, the change having been made by sufficient authority—Proof that the Lord's day was so kept, from the Scriptures, from writers in the first ages of Christianity, Pliny, Ignatius, Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian—Effect of Constantine's edict—Athanasius—Hilary—The doctrine that a perpetual Sabbath is substituted for the Jewish Sabbath, no reason why the Lord's day is not also—Obligation to keep this day from the fourth commandment—In what degree Christians are released from the strict rest there required 87

[*St. Mary's, Oxford, May* 3, 1829.]

APPENDIX.

PAGE

Heylyn's Argument on the Times before the Law 141
Heylyn's Argument from the New Testament 148
The Apostolical Canons 158
Saturday a Fast in the Western Churches..... 164
Saturday a Feast in the Eastern Churches..... 168
Heylyn's Argument from Justin and Tertullian 170
Irenæus 172
Clement of Alexandria 174
Origen..... 181
Cyprian 189
Athanasius 194
Council of Macon 199
Council of Laodicea 200
State of Opinion before the Reformation 202
The Reformed Churches on the Continent..... 210
The Church of England before Queen Mary's reign 220
The Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth 232
The Church of England in the reigns of James and Charles I. 242
Difference of opinion among English Divines 246
The Old and True Doctrine vindicated 260
This Doctrine held by most of the English Divines 266
The Church Catechism 268

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

of Persons and Events mentioned in the following pages, taken chiefly from Blair and Lardner.

	A. D.
Fall of Jerusalem	70
Barnabas's Epistle	71
Death of St. John (æt. 92)	99
——— Clement Bishop of Rome	100
——— Ignatius	108
——— Polycarp (æt. 100)	167
Pliny, jun., his Epistle to Trajan	102
Justin Martyr's First Apology	140
Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, flourished	170
Melito, Bishop of Sardis	178
Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons	ibid.
Clement of Alexandria	194
Tertullian	200
Julius Africanus, Bishop of Emmaus	220
Origen	230
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage	248
Victorinus, Bishop of Pettaw	290
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria	300
Constantine's Edict in favour of the Christians	323
Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, flourished	326
Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers	360
Council of Laodicea	368
Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia	370
Gregory of Nazianzum	ibid.
Gregory of Nyssa	ibid.
Ambrose, Bishop of Milan	374
Augustine, Bishop of Hippo Regius in Africa	395
John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople	398
John Cassian	424

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
REC. NOV 1880
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

SERMON I.

REGENERATION
THE SPIRITUAL GRACE OF BAPTISM.

JOHN iii. 3.

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

THAT in these remarkable words Christ spake of the grace to be received in baptism, can scarcely be doubted by any one who considers that such is the plain and literal meaning of Christ's own explanation of them, such the sense in which they were uniformly understood by the primitive Christians. The Fathers of the Church, for three centuries after the death of St. John, continually cite them in their writings[1], in their public councils, and uniformly

[1] Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Basil, Austin, Cyril, Councils of Carthage. See Wall on Infant Baptism, and Routh's Relic. Sacr. III.

urge them as a proof of the advantage and necessity of baptism: and I cannot but regard the celebrated passage in Justin the Martyr's first Apology [1], as of itself decisive of the sense in which they were understood by the Church at the time they were written.

Professing to shew the way in which converts to the faith are made anew through Christ, and dedicate themselves to God, he thus proceeds: "Whoever firmly believe that what we teach is true, and undertake to live accordingly, are instructed first to seek of God by prayer and fasting, in which we join with them, the pardon of their past sins; then we conduct them to some place where there is water, and they are regenerated after the same manner in which we ourselves were regenerated; for they are washed in the water in the name of God, the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ said, 'Except ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven;' and every one knows it is impossible for those who are once born to enter again into their mother's womb."

[1] Apol. 1ma. prope finem. It is quoted by Bishop Tomline, and referred to by Welchman on the twenty-seventh Article.

This account was written within forty-five years of the time when St. John is said to have written his Gospel, and within forty years after his death; it declares not only what was *then*, but what had been the established practice of the Church; they are regenerated as *we were; we*, the members of the Church, living in Justin's time, and known to him; some of whom, he tells us[1], had been made disciples sixty or seventy years; and among whom certainly St. John himself had lived; as Justin, when he declares him to be the author of the book of Revelations[2], calls him "a man from *among us*, named John, one of the apostles of Christ." Such then being the practice and the language, such was the understanding of my text, on which that practice and language were founded, with those among whom St. John lived.

It is often said that the expression used by our Lord to Nicodemus, "to be born again," had been in common use with the Jews, to signify the admission of a proselyte to their Church by baptism. But to say this is to press the argument from the usage of the Jews beyond what the authorities produced will warrant. The proselyte indeed, when admitted to

[1] Apol. I^ma. prope ab init.

[2] Dial. cum Tryph. p. 89. Justin. Opera. Paris, 1551.

the covenant, was said to be like a child new born; but to his admission circumcision was necessary as well as baptism, and was undoubtedly the more important rite of the two, the more expressly commanded, whatever authority for baptizing proselytes they might think they had in the purification of all members of the Mosaic covenant by the [1] washing of their forefathers at the time when the law was delivered from Mount Sinai, or in their baptism [2] unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Besides, it is questioned whether the Jews, before our Saviour's time, used baptism as an initiatory rite at all: the practice of baptizing proselytes, as described in the Talmud, or explanation of the law by the Jewish Rabbis, is supposed by some [3] to have been borrowed from the Christians; and though the arguments I have seen in support of this supposition are not, in my judgment, sufficient to set aside the Talmud's detailed account of a professedly public practice, it is unwise needlessly to rest the interpretation of my text on a questionable point.

The expression to be born again, to be born

[1] Exod. xix. [2] 1 Cor. x. 2.

[3] Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 442; and Jenning's Jewish Antiq. I. 136.

of God, naturally describes the admission into his Church, into which all who are admitted from the earliest days have been called God's children. From the time God has been known by his name, Jehovah, his true worshippers have been called his children. It was the sons of God [1], they who had learnt to call on the name of the Lord, or to call themselves by his name, who by their marriages with the daughters of men, those who knew Him not, became so corrupt in their hearts, that God swept their race away by the great water-flood. And when He afterwards established his Church for his people Israel, they, even in their disobedience [2], are continually called his children, his sons and his daughters, and the Lord is called the Rock, who begat them. To be admitted, then, into God's Church, his family on earth, is to be made his child, to be born again, to be born of Him.

And further, we should observe that, whatever was the practice of the Jews on admitting proselytes into their covenant, there certainly was an expectation among the Pharisees, that the Christ would make men his disciples by

[1] Gen. iv. 26; vi. 2.

[2] Deut. xiv.; xxxii. 18, 19. Isaiah i. 2.

baptism. "Why baptizest thou[1]," said they to John the Baptist, "if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet." This expectation they probably had derived from the various passages in the prophets, which speak of the cleansing gifts of the Holy Spirit under the figure of water, from the express declaration of Isaiah[2], that the Christ should sprinkle many nations, and especially from the words of Ezekiel, which, though they were spoken of the Jews on their return from captivity, yet surely have a further aim, and were realized under the Christian covenant. "Then will I sprinkle[3] clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; a new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put in you, and will cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them—and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God."

Nicodemus then, a Pharisee and a teacher in Israel, had reason to expect men were to be admitted into the Messiah's kingdom by baptism; he had been accustomed to regard the expression to be born anew, as signifying admission into covenant with God; and be-

[1] John i. 25. [2] Isaiah lii. [3] Ezek. xxxvi.

sides these points, to enable us to understand our Lord's address to him, we ought to consider its bearing on the peculiar feelings and sentiments of his nation. Now, of all the prejudices of the Jews, none perhaps was a greater bar to their reception of Christ, than their prevalent belief that they themselves were already "children of the kingdom, and had one Father[1], even God;" hence, in their minds the coming of the Messiah was associated with expectations of the aggrandisement of *their nation*. Nicodemus certainly knew not that he had yet to seek to be admitted into God's family on earth; he knew not that the title he derived from the Jewish covenant to be so regarded, with that covenant had passed away. Whatever we may reasonably hope of him[2], who was joined with Joseph of Arimathea, in the last pious offices to the crucified body of our Lord, neither now, nor more than a year afterwards, at the feast of tabernacles, was Nicodemus[3] prepared to confess before men, that Jesus is the Christ: though it was a teacher sent from God, whom he desired to hear, he went secretly by night. To him then our Lord declared the necessity

[1] John viii. 41. [2] John xix. 39. [3] John vii. 50.

of seeking earnestly and openly an admission into his kingdom. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, be made a child of God, (or as he explains his words, when Nicodemus trifled, or strangely misunderstood them), except one be born of water and the Spirit, except one be sanctified for God's service by the Spirit, to be sought in my baptism and in the open sincere profession of my doctrine, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,—cannot enter into his kingdom of grace here, the appointed road to his kingdom of glory. This new birth, this admission as a proselyte, is as necessary to your nation as to any other. You must not rely on your natural descent, as children of Abraham. I speak not of a birth from your mother's womb; what is born of the flesh is flesh; it seeks and is entitled to that alone which the flesh can enjoy; it is the spiritual birth, that enables a man to enjoy the things of the Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye, your nation, though Jews, must be thus born again: as the wind blows when it lists, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so the Holy Spirit regenerates whom He will, Jew or Gentile alike; his gracious influences

being discernible in their effects, though you cannot distinguish from your other emotions the beginning or the end of his action on your hearts and minds.

Our Lord addressed Himself to Nicodemus alone; μὴ θαυμάσῃς ὅτι εἶπόν σοι, marvel not that I said unto *thee:* He spake of the necessity of the new birth to him and to his nation; δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, *ye* must be born again. That by the word *ye*, here and in the following verses, Christ meant the countrymen of Nicodemus, the Jewish nation, may appear from this; it was they, who received not his testimony, who believed not when He told them of the need and the means of repentance and a holy life, things which pass on earth [1], and whom He therefore pronounced unprepared to believe, when He should proceed to tell them of things passing in heaven, his own mysterious nature, our redemption through the Son of Man, whose abode is in heaven, and the transcendent love of the eternal Father, who sent his own Son, as man, into the world, that the world through Him might be saved.

It is commonly said that Christ, in this discourse with Nicodemus, alluded, by anticipa-

[1] Conf. verse 31.

tion, to the sacrament of baptism, which He designed to appoint; and certainly the great commission, by authority of which we baptize, "the commission of regeneration," as Irenæus[1] calls it, was not given by Him till after his resurrection; but we read, immediately after the account of this discourse, that it was Christ's practice[2], at this very time, to make men his disciples by baptizing them. And we should observe that St. John, the only evangelist who has recorded the discourse, is the only one who has recorded this practice also; as if the knowledge of the one were necessary to enable us to understand the other. I am aware that a distinction is often made between these baptisms and those afterwards administered in his Church; but it is not easy to conceive how baptism, by which men were made Christ's disciples, could be other than Christian baptism; or how what was administered under his own immediate superintendance, could entitle men in after life to a less blessing than what is now administered according to his command.

But it may be asked, did not our Saviour, by the very expression, "born again," declare that a total change of the heart, "a spiritual

[1] Adv. Hæres. l. III. c. 19. [2] John iii. 22; iv. 1, 2.

regeneration of the character," was necessary to Nicodemus, in order that he might enter into the kingdom of God? Certainly; as Nicodemus well knew the pains that were taken [1] to ascertain the sincerity of the proselyte before he could be admitted into the Jewish covenant, he must have readily understood that none could be admitted into the Christian covenant, but who believed its truths with his heart, and adopted them as the guides of his conduct. Addressed to one of an age capable of so doing, our Lord's words could mean no less. However men, by their misconduct afterwards, may become unworthy of their calling, God makes none his children, allows none to enter his kingdom, but who are as free from opposing principles and opposing practices, as docile, guileless, and innocent, as a little child.

There are, indeed, many persons, far from running into the wild extravagance of some enthusiasts, who yet think that regeneration, our new birth of God, *properly expresses* that change of manner of life, when a man, whether his moral habits previously may have been virtuous or vicious, first begins to act on Christ-

[1] See Wall on Baptism, 1. lxx.

ian principles, and puts on the character of a Christian. That some such change has taken place in most persons, who, having been baptized in their infancy, are living as Christians, must, I think, be admitted. It is, I conceive, common to Christianity with every other system of moral discipline, that they, who from childhood have been educated in it, for the most part, as they shall have come to years of discretion, or at some period of their lives, think upon it more soberly, and adopt its rules and restraints more diligently, than they had done before. That all motions to a godly and religious life are prompted by the Holy Spirit, every Christian will allow: our adoption, then, of the Christian character, whenever this may take place, as far as it is his work, may seem to be truly described as a second and spiritual birth. But surely our spiritual birth, our regeneration, more properly expresses that which is the work of Him alone, whose children we are made; a work in which we have no concurrent share: and the change of the heart and character is a work which God will not effect in us, except we endeavour ourselves to profit by his gracious help: because He works in us both to will and to work, we must therefore work out this which is essential to our sal-

vation: to call then this change our regeneration is liable to this strong objection, among others, inasmuch as it throws into the background and into the shade the important doctrine, the necessity of exertion in us.

Besides, not only do all the writers of the primitive Church agree, that regeneration is the grace of baptism, but in the only place in Scriptures where the word occurs as relating to this life, it is so applied—"the washing[1] of regeneration;" and in this washing, in baptism no such change takes place: in the case of adults, where alone it could be supposed, this change must have taken place before; it is required of them before they are baptized, that they shall have truly repented of and forsaken their sins, believe heartily the Christian doctrine, and sincerely purpose to adorn that doctrine by their manner of life: in *their* baptism then these good resolutions are, no doubt, confirmed, but they are not there made and begun.

It may be thought, however, that as in those early days the greater number of persons baptized had been converted to Christianity after they had grown to manhood, (and if not the

[1] Tit. iii. 5.

more numerous class, these surely would most draw attention), it may be thought, that the primitive Church, in speaking of regeneration as the grace of baptism, did not confine their view to what took place at the time of receiving the sacrament, but looked more largely to the whole change effected in the baptized convert. And it is but reasonable to conceive this should have been so, when the writers themselves had grown up before they became Christians, and had experienced in their own persons the great and salutary change. Such was the case, among others, with Justin and Tertullian, who both owed their conversion, in a great degree, to their observing the powerful and triumphant efficacy of the Christian faith over the minds and lives of men; whence Justin, who was well acquainted with the different systems of the Grecian schools, pronounced Christianity to be "the only [1] sure and profitable philosophy." We cannot be surprised then, that Tertullian [2], with evident reference to our Lord's words to Nicodemus, should describe our entrance on this state as "our second birth, in which the soul is formed, as it were, anew by water and the power from

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. prope ab initio.

[2] De Animâ. c. 41. quoted by Bishop Kaye, p. 327.

above;" or that Justin, at the end of the passage already cited, should tell us that "baptism[1] is called the enlightening, because they who learn the Christian faith are enlightened in their minds." But if from these phrases, "enlightening the mind," and "new forming the soul," it should be inferred that a change of mind and soul, a change of character, was regarded as a part of regeneration, we should observe that term was never employed to express such change, except where it took place on admission to the covenant. And certainly this change of character was not regarded as essential to regeneration; for not only adults, but children, even infants were said to be regenerate, and in them such change was impossible. "Christ," says Irenæus[2], "came to save all by Himself—all, who by Him are regenerated to God, whether infants or little ones, or children, or youths, or those of riper age;" and Irenæus, we should remember, was instructed in the Christian religion by Papias and Polycarp, who had been instructed by St. John himself.

But, it may be said, that the grace of baptism (as our Church expresses it) is a death

[1] Apol. 1ma. So also Clem. Alex. Pædagog. l. I. c. 6.

[2] Iren. Adv. Hæres. l. II. c. 39.

to sin and a new birth to righteousness, and that these expressions must signify a change of heart, a beginning of a holy life, and renunciation of sin. It must be allowed, "to be dead to sin," in the strict and primary sense of this phrase, is to become, in our conduct, insensible to its allurements, unmoved by its power—and in this sense our Church uses it, when speaking of the manner of life we ought constantly to endeavour to lead, she says, "we who are baptized should die from sin, and rise again to righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living." But if we turn to the passage in St. Paul[1], whence the phrase is taken, we do not find it used in its strictest sense there: "How shall we who are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" and it scarce needs remark, that he is here speaking of those who had been baptized into this death. If he had meant that they whom he addressed had already attained that state, in which sin had lost its influence over them, he would not have exhorted them to live no longer in sin. Hammond's[2] interpretation is, "we who in baptism have vowed to die to

[1] Rom. vi. 2.

[2] Paraphrase in locum.

sin;" but whether the apostle speaks of the vow made, or the grace given in baptism, it is the grace given, we have to consider; and the grace corresponding to this vow, is the capacity to keep it, and to be profited by so doing. And such surely is the grace received in baptism. If by baptism we are admitted into the Christian covenant, we are then admitted to the promised mercies of God, as our Redeemer and as our Sanctifier; our death to sin is our deliverance[1] from sin, both, as to its irresistible dominion, through the aid of the Holy Spirit, and, as to its earned punishment, through the cross of Christ; and our birth to righteousness is our entrance on that state, in which it is *promised* the Holy Spirit will be continually given to make us *capable* of acquiring habits of holiness; and where, imperfect as the holiness we can attain must be, we are yet assured, that our sincere, honest endeavours will be accepted and rewarded, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. We (says our Catechism in explanation), we who by nature were born in sin and the children of wrath, are, by baptism, made the children of grace, children of God's favour.

Regeneration then, though in the case of

[1] Rom. vi. 7.

adult converts to Christianity a change of heart necessarily accompanies it, yet regeneration, as applicable to all persons of all ages who are baptized, is not a change of heart and character, but a change of condition, of our relation to God and interest in his mercies; a change from a state of nature to a state of grace—a deliverance from the power [1] of darkness, and translation into the kingdom of his dear Son—a revival from the state of death and condemnation, in which, as descendants of the first Adam, we were naturally born, to a state of salvation, in which, through the second Adam, we are made capable of spiritual life, and so of life eternal. And no one can regard it as too glowing an expression, to call this change our regeneration, our second birth as God's children, if he considers how great a blessing it is to be received into covenant with God, to be delivered from heathenish ignorance and the powers of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son. Nor can the nature of the blessing hereby conveyed be mistaken by any reasonable man. Like all other God's blessings, it is a blessing to those alone who seek to profit by it.

[1] Col. i 13.

Irenæus, though he speaks of infants as regenerated to God, most earnestly urges the necessity of living as Christians, that we may reap the benefits of the Christian covenant; but he always urges this as being in our own power, as depending on our own diligence, and presses it as St. Paul's exhortation[1], "that we should by faith and holy conversation keep in us the Spirit of God, lest, by losing his fellowship, we should lose the kingdom of heaven." He reminds us of that apostle's words "as many[2] as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Nor was he unacquainted with St. John's Epistle, so often urged against the received interpretation of my text, as coming from the pen of the same writer; in which the expression, "born of God," occurs more frequently than in any other part of the New Testament, always, as is alleged, without any reference to baptism; always, as is evident, applied to those alone who are sincere Christians.

That the expression of itself refers to baptism as the time, when the power to become a sincere Christian began to be given, is at least probable, from the fact, that this is the very

[1] Adv. Hæres. L. V. c. 9. [2] Rom. viii. 14.

name, by which the grace of that sacrament is continually described by all the early fathers of the Church; and that St. John, in this epistle, did allude to the initiating sacrament, may further appear from his calling[1] the grace, which enabled them to comprehend what they had heard from the beginning, the *anointing* of the Holy One; and to anoint is to consecrate, and in this sense is expressly applied to the *baptism* of Christ.

But, even if this be not allowed, I cannot see from this Epistle any reason for supposing that another regeneration than that of baptism is necessary, that we may enter into the kingdom of heaven. In it, St. John tells his hearers, not that they must be born of God, in order that they may not sin, but that they must not sin, in order that they may shew themselves to have been truly born of God. He does not say, ye must be born of God, that his seed, the word, may remain in you; but, let the word,—that which ye have heard from the beginning, remain in you, and ye shall continue in the Son and in the Father. Acknowledging that they are now the children of God, he expressly declares, that he "writes[2] to

[1] 1 John ii. 20. 27. cont. 24. [2] Ib. ii. 1.

them that they sin not." And how does he win obedience to this exhortation? he reminds them, "what[1] manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon them, that they should be called the sons of God;" and then he reminds them, what manner of life a sense of that love ought to prompt them to lead. He that is born of God doth not practise sin; "he[2] overcometh the world, he keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not." If there seems to be any difficulty in reconciling these words of St. John with our interpretation of his words in my text, let it be considered, that to be born of God, to be made his child, is the same thing as to be made a Christian; and if I say, all who are baptized are made Christians, and again, a Christian cannot allow himself in sin, no one will think these statements inconsistent, or be at a loss to understand, that in the one I speak of a Christian in privilege, in the other, of a Christian not in privilege only, but in principle and in practice also; and this is what St. John here means by "one born of God."

Of many propositions in this Epistle, *the subject* must be understood in its fullest sense,

[1] 1 John iii. 1, 2. [2] Ib. v. 4. 18.

that we may feel their force and truth:—for instance, "every one that has in him the hope of seeing and being like to Christ at his appearing, purifieth himself even as Christ is pure." The subject here is, he that has this hope profitably, that has it constantly present to his mind and influencing his conduct; such an one will endeavour to purify himself after the example of our Lord: and so the expression "born of God" is to be taken for one having that blessing, and having withal a just sense of the importance of profiting by it; and such an one cannot sin—it is morally impossible such an one should allow himself in the practice of sin. All that is essential to regeneration, for it to be complete, is that God should adopt us as his children, graft us into his Church, and give us a covenant-claim to those continual helps of the Holy Spirit, which may enable us to live according to his word: but it is essential to regeneration, for it to be profitable to us, that we receive not this grace in vain, that we exert ourselves to walk worthy of our calling, to become like our heavenly Father, and as his children, strive to follow the example of his first-born, Christ, our Lord. And what stronger, what more encouraging motive can we have for this exertion, than the remem-

brance of his love, his parental care and kindness towards us. Being his[1] sons and his daughters, we must therefore cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit; being born again[2], we must therefore lay aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and evil speaking; being begotten of God[3], we must therefore lay apart all superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save our souls. Such is the language of Scripture, and such is the doctrine of the Church.

But for those, who having been admitted at their baptism to this glorious privilege, the adoption as children of God, yet live in a total neglect of their high calling, are they to be told that they must now be born again? Can their case be regarded as no worse than that of the heathen, to whom the Gospel and its privileges have never been given? These privileges, it is true, cannot be of service to those who have never learnt to value them. To have been born again, to have received life, is nothing, except that life be supported by its proper food. Hence the great commis-

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 18.; vii. 1. [2] 1 Pet. i. 23.; ii. 1.
[3] James i. 18. 21.

sion of regeneration was not to baptize only, but to baptize and to teach; and to say nothing of what is now the more rare case, that of persons baptized at riper years, our Church baptizes no infants without receiving a pledge that they shall be taught the truths of the Gospel, except when it is to be feared death may hurry the little innocent away, before it can have a knowledge of duty or of sin. How much religion has suffered from a neglect of this pledge in the sponsors, it is not my purpose now to enquire. I only say, they solemnly pledge themselves at the font to see that the child be brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life—a life according to that its Christian beginning; and even where the sponsors may have altogether neglected their duty, under the most unfavourable circumstances, if they, who have been admitted into the pale of the Christian Church, and live amongst Christians, are wholly ignorant of their Christian calling, their ignorance has not the same excuse with that of the poor heathen, to whom preachers have never been sent. If Christ had not called them, they had not had sin; but though they had been baptized in all the unconsciousness of infancy, yet as they have grown up, the sight of our Churches through-

out the land, the weekly observance of the Lord's day, the outward practice of sincere Christians around them, these visible circumstances of religion have been a witness to them that there is what they have to learn; by these Christ has called them, and their neglect of the call has been a wilful sin. They may have been standing all their life's day idle, but they cannot say, no one has hired them. Surely to represent their sad case aright, we must shew them the guilt of their past neglect, not throw a veil over it, by telling them they must now be born again; we must shew them the guilt of having neglected to learn God's word, and so to seek the aid of his Holy Spirit in obeying it, not teach them to expect a sanctifying influence on their hearts, which it had not been in their power to seek and obtain before; we must tell them they need not so much to be made, as to make themselves truly God's children, by that same help, which, though they, thoughtless and thankless, have slighted it, has yet been continually offered them.

To every Christian, indeed, the remembrance of that marvellous manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called His children, must be a most cogent

motive, that in all our life and conversation we strive to bear ourselves harmless, blameless[1], the sons of God, walking as becomes the children of our Father in heaven. And to our exertions we must add our prayers for the aid of the Holy Spirit, promised to be given to the prayers of all in the Christian covenant. For if a man cannot enter into that covenant, except by the grace of the Holy Spirit, then given when it is sought in baptism, if we cannot enter into the kingdom of God, except we be born again of water and the Spirit; that same heavenly aid, which was necessary to our entrance on a Christian life, must be necessary to us at every step and turn, that we may continue to walk therein; to restore, renew, and revive those who have fallen away; to confirm the feeble endeavours of those who are struggling against temptations; to advance all to greater degrees of holiness, that we, who at the font were made babes in Christ and children of God, may grow in grace, and be strengthened in the knowledge and the practice of our duties, till we attain those fixed and settled habits of godliness and virtue, till we come to that measure of piety, which may

[1] Phil. ii. 15.

be regarded as the full growth of a Christian: then, if we thus cherish within us the seed of spiritual life given at our first regeneration, we may look forward in the full assurance of hope to receive eternal life in that second regeneration[1], when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory.

The case of adults receiving baptism in insincerity, without true repentance and faith, has been designedly omitted in the foregoing discourse, because the attempt to shew that such persons are regenerated by their baptism seems not to be warranted by Scripture, and to offend many who might otherwise embrace the truly Scriptural doctrine of our Church. If such persons unhappily should continue unto death in their impenitence and unbelief, no one will say, they have been made God's children; if, on the other hand, they should sincerely repent and believe, and give proof of this by their honest endeavours to live as Christians, no one will deny, they have received the Spirit of adoption: but whether in this case they have been regenerated by means of

[1] Matt. xix. 28.

the Sacrament they slighted, or by means of their penitence for that presumptuous sin, we surely are not called upon to determine. Dr. Waterland contends that baptism to them is like an indenture, which at the font is executed on one side only, and gives them a title to the Christian's inheritance when it becomes executed on their side also: and he argues, that they were put into a Christian state at their baptism, because otherwise they would remain as Pagans, till a new baptism should make them Christians. But this argument, by which he would support his opinion, is very unsatisfactory. That baptism is never to be repeated, all allow, though it may happen to be repeated unknowingly, if there have been a doubt whether in the first instance it was rightly administered, with the matter and the form of words which Christ prescribed; but if nothing was wanting on the administration of the Sacrament but a proper frame of mind in him who received it, assuredly it may not on this account be administered again, for this among other reasons, because none can see the secrets of the heart, and say, that he, who has once been insincere on such an occasion, may not be insincere again: God's sacraments are not to be trifled with: and the natural punishment

of the sin above described, is that such an one deprives himself of the comfortable assurance of his adoption, which he might have had, if he had received it at the font. That his sin indeed is pardoned, and all its consequences removed on his faith and repentance, none will doubt: but I do not think all will allow, that his baptism has been the means of procuring his pardon, and consequent adoption as a child of God. Baptism is the appointed means of man's "regeneration[1] unto God:" it is *generally necessary* in order that we may be made God's children, and placed in a state of salvation. Yet there may be those whom God regenerates in other ways: adult converts, for instance, who before they have been baptized with water, have suffered martyrdom for the faith, have always been regarded in their deaths as[2] regenerate and incorporated

[1] Iren. Adv. Hær. L. I. c. 18.

[2] This, says Tertullian, speaking of martyrdom, is a "baptism, which stands in the place of the washing by water, if it has not been received, and restores it, if it has been lost." De Baptismo, c. 16. After urging the necessity of baptism, our new birth of water and of the Spirit, the seal and assurance of the grace of God, Jewell adds, that "the outward baptism by water is not *necessary* to salvation, *so*

members of Christ's Church, having been "baptized with the very baptism, that Christ was baptized withal." And besides this, Bp. Jewel allows, there may be a baptism of the Spirit, where that by water cannot be obtained.

The doctrine of our Church is, that "the Sacraments have a wholesome [1] effect and operation in such only as worthily receive the same:" as to little children, whose guileless innocency we all must imitate, who in this their spiritual regeneration receive (to use Cyprian's [2] expression) "remission not of their own sins, but of those of another," it cannot be said of them, that they do not receive the sacrament of baptism worthily, that there is in them any bar to the promised

that they that die without it, are for lack thereof damned. The Church hath always received three sorts of baptism; the baptism of the Spirit, or of blood, or of water. If any were prevented by death, or hindered by cruelty or persecution, so that they could not receive the sacrament of baptism at the hands of the ministers, yet having the sanctification of the Holy Ghost, or making their faith known by their suffering, they were born anew and baptized."—A Treatise of the Sacraments, gathered out of Sermons which Bp. Jewell preached at Salisbury. P. 26. London. 1603.

[1] Art. XXV.

[2] Cypriani Epist. LIX. Routh's Rel. Sacr. iii. p. 77.

blessing: but as to adults, the Article above quoted expressly declares that baptism has no wholesome effect in them, if they receive it in insincerity and unbelief. Again, our service for baptizing adults carefully describes the persons to be baptized as "truly repenting and coming to Christ by faith:" if, then, they are not the persons so described, the blessing pronounced is not pronounced of them. And thus in our Liturgy, where blessings are declared to have been conferred, they are declared to have been conferred on those alone who *are* or *have been* such as the persons receiving them are there described.

It has been attempted, indeed, to carry this principle further in the baptismal services, and it has been said, that persons baptized are there declared regenerate only on the supposition that *they will thereafter* live as Christians: but they who advance this interpretation, must themselves allow it to be untenable, if they will but consider, first, that in the very place where our Church pronounces of all infants, and of all adults who in repentance and faith have received the holy rite, that they are, in their baptism, regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, she makes it the subject of her prayer, that they

may continue God's servants, *may* abolish the whole body of sin, and *may lead* the rest of their lives according to that of its Christian beginning; and secondly, that in the office for the private baptism of infants, in which, as it is only to be administered on the apprehension of death, there is no stipulation for the child's future manner of life, the baptism is here also immediately followed by thanksgiving to God, that "it *hath* pleased Him to regenerate the child with his Holy Spirit."

SERMON II.

THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST THE SPIRITUAL GRACE OF THE EUCHARIST.

John vi. 53, 54.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

These words, we are told, appeared an hard saying, so that many of his disciples went back and walked with Jesus no more. They knew not the way, in which he would give his flesh and his blood for the life of the world. But to us, to whom that knowledge has been given, as to the twelve, these words of eternal life may appear to have arisen naturally, and after our Saviour's usual manner, from the occasion which suggested them. It was his usual manner of instruction to turn passing events to the spiritual improvement of his hearers; and

the earnestness with which the people had followed him after the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, furnished an occasion to lead their thoughts, by a natural transition, from the food of the body to the more important food of the soul; from the life which bread sustains, to the life which is sustained by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. "Labour not," says our Lord, "for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat that endureth to everlasting life:" and when they, rightly understanding the precept, ask, "What are the works of God, in which we are to labour?" he answers them, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent;" and they ask for some sign, some miracle done, as a proof that they should believe on him, as the gift of manna in the wilderness was a sign and proof to their forefathers that they should believe Moses; and Jesus said, "I am the true, the living bread, which came down from heaven; he that eateth this bread, he that eateth me, he that believeth on me, shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth

my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." To eat, then, the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, to feed on this living bread from heaven, is to believe on him crucified, on him giving his flesh and his blood for the life of the world; it is to gather nourishment and strength for our souls, to gain an interest in all the benefits of his passion, by receiving his words with faith, and by fixing our thoughts, our hopes, and affections, on the mighty sacrifice, which tells us the deep guilt of sin in the price required for its pardon; which tells us the certainty of pardon to all who seek it with true penitence and lively faith; and which tells us of the boundless love of God, who spared not to use these marvellous means for our salvation. To them that thus spiritually feed on him, his flesh is meat indeed, his blood is drink indeed,—are truly meat and drink, as truly giving health, and strength, and life. Not like the manna in the wilderness, which gave life to the body only, and that for a season, this true bread from heaven gives both spiritual and eternal life both to body and soul. "I will raise him up," said Christ, "at the last day." Whosoever so eat his flesh and drink his blood, they abide in

Christ and Christ in them; they abide in the love of Christ, and his words, which are spirit, which are life, which convey to all that desire it the aid of the Spirit, and thereby convey spiritual and eternal life through him, his words abide in them: and we know, that as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can we, except we thus abide in Christ. Christ is the vine, we are the branches.

It is sometimes supposed, that in the strong and striking expressions of my text, our Lord alluded to the sacrament of his body and blood, which he instituted just a year from this time. But there does not seem to be sufficient reason for this supposition, which gives them a sense, in which they could not have been understood at all by his hearers at the time he uttered them; and yet, as in the institution of that sacrament, so probably here also, his words had reference to the same thing—the eating the flesh of the paschal lamb in commemoration of the blood once sprinkled for the deliverance of Israel. As at his last supper, so now also, the thought of this flesh and of this blood was uppermost in the minds of his hearers; for now the feast of the Jews, the Passover, was nigh; and this reference would have been

understood by them all, as far as they had understood the Baptist's exclamation on seeing Jesus, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world!"

But though I hold, in the language of one whose authority must ever be respected in this place, the martyred Cranmer, that, in my text, Christ "spake[1] not of sacramental eating, but of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort he was at the same present time eaten of as many as believed on him, although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted;" yet, from the time of its institution, these his words bind all Christians to live in the habit of often receiving that holy sacrament with a force which none can elude, who seek to draw their rule of life from the book of God's Word. The spiritual feeding on Christ, which is here declared necessary to us under the dreadful alternative of life or of death, is the very grace which that sacrament conveys. In this essential truth the whole Christian Church has always agreed; the mode in which the blessing is conveyed being the only point on which there has been any difference of opinion.

[1] See the Fathers of the English Church, III. 386. London, 1807.

And here the whole question has been, in what sense our Lord said of the bread, "This is my body," and of the cup, "This is my blood." Some, indeed, have allowed no greater force to these words than if it had been said, This is a sign of my body or blood. But passing by this interpretation as far beneath both the expression and the occasion, the different opinions of Christians on this point may be classed under these two heads—they who understand that the consecrated elements are called the body and blood of Christ, because they are such in power and in effect, and they who understand they are so called, because they are such in their very substance also.

To this last class both the Roman and the Lutheran Churches belong. The Roman Church maintains, that though the form, colour, smell, taste, in short, all the *accidents* of bread and wine remain after their consecration the same as they were before, yet *their substance* is wholly gone and changed into the *substance* of the body and blood of Christ, which alone remain under these *accidents* of bread and wine. The Lutherans, to guard alike against this Roman conceit, and that of the Zuinglians degrading the consecrated elements into mere

signs, maintain, that, after consecration, the bread and wine remain indeed unchanged, but that with them the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present.

But neither the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, nor the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, agree with the language of Scripture; and, on this account, not for their strangeness, we reject them. The Lutherans, without a shadow of such authority, assert the presence of two substances in each of the consecrated elements. The Romanists, with apparently more reason, contend that theirs is the literal interpretation of our Saviour's words. Here, however, the literal interpretation cannot stand. Not to dwell on points so often urged, Christ declaring of the bread, "This *is* my body broken," of the cup, "This *is* my blood which is shed," at that time his body not having been broken, nor his precious blood been shed; and again, the consecrated elements being continually spoken of in Scripture as still being what they were, St. Paul still calling them the bread and the cup, and Christ himself still calling this last the fruit of the vine,—it has often appeared to me, that a slight variation of expression in the different accounts of the institution, (as if it

had been done by design) most conclusively shews that the words are to be understood, not literally, but in a spiritual sense. In St. Matthew and St. Mark we read, Christ said of the cup, "This is my blood of the new testament." In St. Paul, and his companion St. Luke, Christ's words are, "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Now these last words will not admit a literal interpretation; but if we understand them in a spiritual and sacramental sense, as giving them the fullest force they will bear; if we understand that Christ said, This *is*, because it *is in effect*, because it is, not a mere sign or token, but the very means of conveying the spiritual benefits signified by it, it matters not whether those spiritual benefits be called his blood dedicating the new testament, or the new testament dedicated by his blood: either expression signifies precisely the same thing, namely, the blessings which, under that covenant, the shedding of his blood has purchased for us. It is a most cogent argument for the correctness of this interpretation, that it fits, with equal propriety, either of the expressions of the inspired writers, and shews that, in either case, with equal fidelity, they expressed the sense of the very words our Saviour used.

In this spiritual and sacramental sense then, we understand those words, remembering that Christ himself taught us, that his words in my text, so closely allied to them, are to be spiritually understood; and that his flesh and blood, on which he bade us feed, should not remain on earth, but should ascend with him to heaven. "Does this offend you?" said he to his disciples, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." We believe that Christ is truly and really present in his sacrament; not substantially, indeed, either in the bread and wine, as the Romanists hold, nor with them, as the Lutherans suppose, but spiritually, in the hearts and souls of all faithful communicants. When our Church, in her catechism, declares, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, she declares that his body and blood are an inward and spiritual grace, and that the faithful alone so receive them.

That the primitive Church believed, not a corporeal and substantial, but a spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament, has been amply shewn (among other Protestant writers) by Archbishop Cranmer, and, in later times,

by Dr. Waterland, in their Treatises on this subject; and with the light of their criticisms we can be at no loss to interpret correctly the writings of the early days. The expression, indeed, so frequently used by the Fathers, that in this sacrament our bodies are fed by the body and blood of Christ, may, perhaps, appear to some minds a strong expression: yet our Reformers constantly urged this very expression[1] as an argument against the gross notion of a corporeal and substantial presence, and appealed to the principle laid down by St. Austin, that the heinousness and wickedness involved in the very idea of literally eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, was conclusive against such an interpretation. The expression, no doubt, meant nothing more than that a blessing is assured to our bodies, since they are nourished with food consecrated to so high a purpose; just as, in the admirable catechism[2] of Nowel, (which, sanctioned as it was by the full and deliberate approval of the assembled clergy, is a standing summary of the doctrines of our

[1] Cranmer on Sacr. B. III. English Fathers, III. p. 431. and Ridley, ibid. IV. p. 195.

[2] Strype's Life of Abp. Parker, III. 17. Synod of 1562, though not published till 1570.

Church,) it is said, that not only our souls are nourished by the sacred body and blood, as their appropriate food, but that, as our bodies also receive the symbols of eternal life, a pledge is given of their resurrection and immortality. Irenæus, indeed, plainly shews, that it is not the substance of Christ's body and blood, by which he declares our bodies to be fed. "How[1]," says he, "shall they deny the flesh to be capable of eternal life, when it is fed by the body and blood of Christ, and is member of him, just as St. Paul says to the Ephesians, 'We are members of his body, and of his flesh, and his bones.'" And if we consider how much what purifies the soul, the seat and source of thought, purifies the body also, its instrument of action, it is not too much, perhaps, to say, that in this most solemn act of devotion we receive an earnest of that spiritualising power, when our sinful bodies shall be made clean by Christ's body, and His precious body and blood shall preserve us both in body and soul.

It is not denied that the early Fathers, in speaking of this sacrament, often employed a stronger language than we should now em-

[1] Iren. Adv. Hæres. V. c. 2.

ploy; as where Irenæus not only says, that the consecrated bread is no longer "common bread, but that it consists of two things, an earthly and an heavenly [1];"—an expression which, whatever the Romanists may make of it, the Lutherans certainly may appeal to in support of their doctrine;—but his comparison, just now cited, between Christ's mystical body, the Church, and His body given in the sacrament, makes it clear that this was not the doctrine of Irenæus; and his learned editor, Dr. Grabe, has satisfactorily accounted for the strong language of the primitive Fathers, on the Eucharist, by shewing, that it was the general belief, in those early days, that, as the Church is called the body of Christ, because His Spirit dwells amongst her members; so the bread and wine are called His body and blood, because His Spirit and life-giving power are communicated first to these symbols on their consecration, and, by their means, to the souls of all who receive them worthily.

We hold then, in common with the primitive Church, that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, because they are so not in substance, but in effect and in power.

[1] Ibid. IV. c. 34.

We hold, in common with them, that these are the means and instruments, whereby He is verily and indeed present in the souls of all faithful communicants. In the interpretation of all the Scripture says on the subject, we altogether agree: the only difference appears in the very nice and subtle question, whether the blessing is first imparted to the instrument which conveys it to us. Many of the early writers of the Church seem to have conceived that this was so [1], as if this was necessary, in order that the sacred elements may be the means of conveying grace to us. We only teach that these spiritual blessings are communicated to our souls on receiving the bread and wine as Christ appointed; and as it undoubtedly seems more accurate to say that spiritual gifts are communicated to spiritual natures than to the inanimate symbols, it is but reasonable to think, that these holy men of old, when speaking of this sacrament, only

[1] Even of the waters used in baptism, Tertullian says, that, after the prayer of consecration, "The Spirit from heaven moves over the face of the waters, sanctifying them himself, and they thus receiving sanctification, receive at the same time the power of sanctifying."—De Baptism. c. 4; Bishop Kaye's Eccles. Hist. illus. from Tertull. p. 433.

gave vent to their feelings of pious gratitude in a warm and unconstrained language; whereas they would have expressed themselves with more guard and caution, could they have foreseen the countenance their language has since given to the notion of a substantial and corporal presence, and thereby to the strange and pernicious errors, of supposing the body and blood of Christ in this sacrament[1] received by any who are void of a lively faith, of administering the sacrament in one kind only as sufficient, or of bending down before the elements themselves in idolatrous worship.

And indeed, if the doctrine of a corporal presence did not lead to such errors in opinion and in practice, it would, perhaps, be of less moment to point out its inconsistency with holy writ. Were it not for these errors, it would be a matter of less moment nicely to determine, what the consecrated elements are in themselves, so long as it be remembered, what they are to us—so long as *that* alone be urged as an essential article of belief, which the truth of Scripture plainly requires, and the whole Catholic Church in all her great branches has always acknowledged,—namely, that in

[1] Ridley against Transubstant. Enchirid. Theol. I. p. 72, or English Fathers, IV. p. 183.

this sacrament, as we receive the bread and wine, the souls of faithful communicants are strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of our crucified Lord. These are the very appointed means, whereby we may spiritually eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, and therefore are to be thankfully received by all who believe in him that appointed them, and seek through him eternal life.

I do not mean to say, that at no other times and by no other means can our souls feast on this heavenly food. They, no doubt, who live in the habit of receiving this sacrament whenever occasion offers, at other times also in their devotional exercises hold spiritual communion with our Lord. They, again, who from their tender years and unripe capacities are not able justly to appreciate these mysterious means of grace, which are to be received in *remembrance* of Christ, and by none but who *consider* his body, they are not thereby deprived of the seed of eternal life through him, but, having been baptized into his mystical body, draw their spiritual sustenance from him, who is the head, according to his effectual working in the measure of every part. And they again, as I hope, who are children, not

in years, but in Christian knowledge, who have not been instructed how to seek spiritual food for their souls in this heavenly feast; and they, we may be sure, who heartily desire the comfort of this holy sacrament, but are debarred from receiving it by some just impediment, and by no default of their own; these, if with unfeigned repentance and stedfast faith they fix their grateful hearts, their earnest minds on Jesus dying for their salvation, eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood profitably to their souls' health, though they do not receive this sacrament with their mouths. But let not these exceptions, which the reason of the case, with more or less force, points out, be pressed beyond what that reason requires. To all who can understand these mysteries, and are invited to receive them, who have learned to look beyond the visible elements set before them, and by faith to lift up their hearts to the Lord, they are the appointed means by which we may spiritually eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, and except we so eat his flesh and drink his blood, we have no life in us.

There is, indeed, a sect of Christians who think nothing further obligatory than a mere spiritual communion, and their ingenious apo-

logist has argued, that there is no more reason for literally following the example of Christ and his Apostles, in taking bread and wine to commemorate his death, than for literally following his example given them on the very same occasion, to wash one another's feet, as he, their Lord and Master, had washed their feet. The argument is plausible; but on an attentive consideration of St. John's narrative it appears, that by this act of condescending love, which the Gospel history shews to have been then the common practice of the country, Christ did but illustrate the general principle expressed in his new commandment, that we should love one another after the pattern and measure of his love for us; and the only other place [1], where this particular practice is afterwards mentioned in the New Testament, leads to the inference, that it was not even there regarded as an universal duty. With respect to the sacraments, the case is widely different; and that in these it is our duty literally to do what Christ has directed us to do, is placed beyond the reach of controversy, by the recorded practice of the Church, under the guidance and government of the Apostles them-

[1] 1 Tim. v. 10.

selves. To press the Quaker, in his rejection of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with the mere words of its institution, would be as idle as to press the Romanist, in his denial of the cup to laymen, with the mere injunction of Christ to his Apostles, "Drink ye all of this;" but when it is shewn that St. Paul has taught us, the very words, in which this sacrament was instituted, were addressed not to the Apostles alone, but to all members of the Church till the Lord shall come, both the Quaker and the Romanist receive an answer, which neither the one nor the other shall ever be able to gainsay.

Whether, then, we regard them as our Lord's last command on the night before his suffering, or rather as a gracious invitation then given for the welfare of his Church, to us all are the words addressed, "Do this in remembrance of me;" and the bread we break, and the cup we bless according to his appointment, we are assured, are to us the communion of that, his precious body and blood, without which we have no life in us. And who shall presume to think, that by any other devotional exercises and meditations they feed on the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, if they yet live in a wilful neglect of this holy

sacrament, which He instituted to quicken our faith and love by quickening our remembrance of Him?

Christ, who knew what was in the heart of man,—how much this world's affairs and trials tend to draw it aside from heaven, knew that this remembrance of him would be necessary to support and strengthen, in their Christian duties, even those who had been his constant followers on earth,—the diligent, faithful hearers of the truth from his own lips,—the appointed messengers to communicate that truth to the world, when he returned to heaven. They, one would think, could not but remember him; yet to them he gave the gracious precept, "Do this in remembrance of me." What man living, then, is there, who can think he has less need of this continual remembrance of Christ than they, his chosen companions and Apostles,—the eye-witnesses of his suffering and of his glory?

Such, then, being appointed by Christ as the means, whereby our souls may be strengthened and refreshed by his body and blood, whereby, being kept in a thankful remembrance of him, and consequently of our duties towards him, we each may have a personal interest in his sacrifice, no man can be said to lead the life of

a Christian, who neglects to seek in this sacrament grace, and help, and strength for his Christian warfare. These hallowed means of grace, indeed, from their very nature, are not designed for the earlier years of our boyhood; but we ought to be thankful that, from the time we enter on that period of life when the passions gain their full force, and a more free and unconstrained intercourse with the world opens the way to all its various temptations, Christ has provided for us these continual remembrancers of our Christian calling, to draw us more closely to him, and strengthen the bond of our union with his mystical body.

A consciousness, however, of the temptations to which they are exposed from without and from within, often has had the effect of deterring persons from receiving this sacrament, which was given as the very means to enable us more effectually to resist the tempter: such persons on making that strict self-examination, without which none should presume to eat this bread and drink this cup, on searching their past conduct and seeing what their failings have been, shrink back and fear to receive the sacrament, lest afterwards, by falling again into the same offences, they should become doubly guilty in the sight of God, and so find

but death in the very food of life. *If* this fear arises from any insincerity of mind, from a cherished fondness for some favorite sin, a secret conviction that they will not endeavour to break off the evil practice, such persons certainly ought not to receive the sacrament in such an unrepenting state of mind; but let them consider, Christ will never acknowledge as his, those who wilfully persist in sin; whatever be the favorite indulgence, though dear as the right hand or the right eye, they must pluck it away and cast it from them, if they would be acknowledged as His: The choice lies before them—if they choose the pleasures of sin, whether they receive the sacrament or not, they draw on their heads their own condemnation;—and this is the very ground of "the condemnation, that [1] light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."—They, while they continue in such a state, have neither part nor lot in this matter: but *if* the fear of offending after receiving the sacrament arises only from a consciousness of their own infirmity, which they yet heartily and sincerely desire to overcome, if they have an honest pur-

[1] John iii. 19.

pose to do what is right to the best of their power, they may well seek to strengthen that purpose and desire by this remembrance of their Saviour's passion. These are they that travail and are heavy laden with a sense of their infirmities; to them Christ utters the gracious words, "Come[1] unto me, and I will refresh you." If a man be insincere, when he receives this sacrament, he makes light of the solemn service, and provokes the vengeance of the Almighty; but if we are sincere, and really seek by these means to strengthen our love of God, He will support us under temptations, or, if from human weakness we fall, will pardon us on our repentance.

It appears from St. Luke[2], that Judas was present when our Lord instituted the sacrament of his body and blood; but Judas could not at that time have had any honesty or sincerity of mind; it was the interval between his covenanting with the priests for the price, and his accomplishment of the foulest treason that ever stained the heart of man: that sacrament was to him but an aggravation of his guilt, a pledge of his condemnation. There was also another of the twelve, who fell into sin

[1] Matt. xi. 28. [2] Luke xxii. 21.

after having received the sacrament; but though Peter sunk under the trial which led him to deny our Lord, there can be no question of the honesty and sincerity of his heart when he received the symbols of his Master's body and blood: he received the sacrament worthily, and his weakness was pardoned, and his pardon and recovery pronounced before his fall.

A consciousness of infirmity then, if it be accompanied by a *sincere* desire to get the better of that infirmity, so far from affording a reason for neglecting this sacrament, should prompt a man more earnestly to seek it, given as it was, to strengthen our feeble purposes, and help us under all temptations by a continual remembrance of Christ. Without *sincerity* there can be no real religion—no benefit from this or from any other religious exercise. Except he be *sincere* in his desire to live according to God's commands, no man can imagine his soul in any way, measure, or degree, as drawing that sustenance from the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, without which we have no life in us. Rather, looking both to the necessity and to the blessing of thus spiritually feeding on Christ, set before us by himself, under the tremendous alterna-

tive of life or of death; let us all eagerly embrace every opportunity of receiving the sacrament of his body and blood, that by this continual remembrance of his death, we may make it the habitual frame of our minds, to give ourselves wholly to him, and draw from him the hope and means of life; for the benefit of this sacrament is not confined to the time and moment of receiving it; but as our natural food supports our bodies, so this supernatural and spiritual food also, digested in the heart, keeps up the general strength and health of the soul: the sense of the guilt of receiving it unworthily, will serve to deter from sin all who make it their constant practice to receive it often; and more, the grateful sense of immortal love there displayed, will lay hold of the best affections of their hearts, leaving no lack of the most powerful motives, as it will leave no lack of spiritual help, to dispose them to act, and think, and feel, in all things as becomes a Christian; thus realizing the gracious promise, that they who feed on this living bread, shall never hunger and never thirst, and giving an earnest and a foretaste of the yet more gracious promise of our Lord, "I will raise them up to eternal life on the last day."

SERMON III.

IN WHAT RESPECTS THE LAW IS ABOLISHED.

GAL. i. 25.

He which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the faith he once destroyed.

IN considering the conversion of St. Paul, two points immediately arrest our observation—the extraordinary means by which it was effected, and the previous character of the Apostle.

He had been sent from his native place to Jerusalem to be educated by Gamaliel[1], a teacher of the law of the highest reputation; and, under the instruction of such a master, had profited in the Jews' religion[2] above his equals in age. Nor was it mere knowledge he had acquired. They who knew his manner

[1] Acts xxii. [2] Gal. i.

of life from his youth up, knew that he had lived after the straitest sect, a Pharisee [1], in his strict obedience to the law, blameless. Nay, that very offence for which, on another occasion, he describes himself as "the chief of sinners [2]," his persecution of the Church of Christ, the Apostle himself tells us, was an evidence [3] of his zeal for the Jews' religion: "concerning zeal, persecuting the Church." The whole nation had regarded it a religious duty to stone to death all blasphemers against the law, according to the ordinance by which it had once been necessary to preserve their religion pure and undefiled in the midst of an idolatrous world: and as they looked on Christians as blasphemers, as opposers of the law the Lord had given, they wildly thought, as Christ had foretold, that by killing them they were "doing God a service."

Saul, young and warm in what he deemed the service of religion, was among the foremost in the exercise of this misguided, this strange, this phrenzied zeal. In the midst of his mad career, he was arrested by a voice from heaven, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Devoted to religion, though in error, Saul must

[1] Phil. iii 6; Acts xxvi. 4, 5. [2] 1 Tim i. 15. [3] Phil. iii.

have been strongly affected, if on his journey towards Damascus he had been assured in any ordinary manner, that they, against whom his fury was bent, were truly the disciples of the long promised Messiah, who regarded them with so dear a love, that to persecute them was to persecute him. With what irresistible force then must the touching expostulation have pierced his inmost soul, issuing from that glorious light above the brightness of the sun, which, as he beheld it, struck him blind? The miracle too was wrought for him alone; the bystanders, his attendants, saw indeed the light and heard the voice; but they neither suffered from the one, nor understood the other. But Saul remained three days without sight, fasting,—rapt, no doubt, in deep meditation. That heavenly light, which had blinded the outward organ, so much the rather "shone inward, and his mind through all her powers irradiated," that he might see and understand those Scriptures which he had learnt at Gamaliel's feet, and which he now perceived testify of Jesus, that he is the Christ. "God[1], who commanded the light to shine out of

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 6.

darkness, shone then in his heart, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." After the three days, by another miracle, his blindness was removed; there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized.

The conversion of St. Paul then, effected by these miracles, has little or no resemblance to the sudden conversions sometimes said to take place in immoral and dissolute persons. Saul had not to begin the task of controuling the desires of the flesh, and the humours of the will, from a sense of duty to God; in this practice he had been trained up from his youth; here his habits had been formed; he had only to pursue the same course from a better principle, and with an enlightened mind. His conversion was an enlightening of his understanding, not a change of his moral habits; from a conscientious, zealous, but mistaken Jew, he became a conscientious, zealous, and right-minded Christian. And yet, provided we do not lose sight of the distinguishing features of his case, the high favor shown to this Apostle is a fit argument of comfort to all who are brought with since-

rity of heart to acknowledge the Lord. "For this cause[1]," says he, "I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him."

But the more important end effected by St. Paul's conversion, was that he might bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles and before the children of Israel. He who had acquired a perfect knowledge of the Jews' religion, who had learned the law with all the errors the prejudices of his countrymen had grafted on it, and whose zeal for the traditions of their fathers was known to all by his persecution of the Christian Church, he was the chosen vessel to preach the faith he once destroyed, and to teach mankind, that the law and the covenant given by Moses, had been designed to continue for a time only, and to be displaced in the latter days, or rather to be fulfilled by the everlasting Gospel of Christ.

Besides their expectation of the Messiah as a temporal prince, the Jews found an obstacle to the reception of the Christian faith, in its supposed opposition to the law and customs of Moses. This respect for their ancient

[1] 1 Tim. i. 16.

religion, bound up with their very existence as a nation, and, above all, sanctioned by the word of God himself, was deeply seated in their hearts, and grounded on their best affections. And though that religion, if rightly understood, would have led them to Christ, the people at large were otherwise taught by the Priests, and Scribes, and Pharisees, to whom[1], as sitting in Moses' seat, it was their duty to look for instruction—"We are Moses' disciples,"—they were taught to say—"We know[2] that God spake unto Moses: as for this man, we know not whence he is." The first disciples of Christ, being poor and unlearned men, were represented as misled by their ignorance, while the unbelief of those who were distinguished for their knowledge of the law, was urged as a forcible argument against the faith in Jesus: "Have[3] any of the Rulers or Pharisees," it was demanded, "believed on him? but this people is accursed," have lost the blessing of Israel, because they "know not the law."

And it was not the unbelievers only among the Jews, who were prejudiced by a misguided

[1] Matt. xxiii. 2. [2] John ix. 28, 29.
[3] John vii. 48, 49.

reverence for the law. The Jewish converts were too apt to imagine that their observance of its ordinances gave them an advantage over their Gentile brethren; nay, it was long before even the Apostles themselves were altogether free from these prejudices—prejudices which in them probably derived a strength from their knowledge, how strictly Christ himself had kept the law during his ministry. They did not immediately perceive that the covenant given to Moses was then to be set aside, when the new covenant was dedicated and sealed with the sacred blood.

Evil, whether in our thoughts or in our feelings, is never so difficult to contend against, as when it is found entwined with good: the consciousness of adhering to something which is right, blinds the understanding, that it perceives not the evil mingled with it: and as the prejudices of Jews concerning the law infected even those among them who believed, they corrupted the very channel by which a knowledge of Christianity was to be poured out on the world.

To root out errors, so grounded in religious feelings, so pernicious in their consequences, it seems to have been ordained, that one who had been taught according to the perfect

manner of the law of their fathers, and who in his zeal for it had outdone the Jewish hierarchy itself, that *Paul* by a special grace should be converted to the faith, in order that he might declare to the world, the true relation the law bears to the Gospel. "He was[1] separated for this work from his mother's womb."

And the election of St. Paul for this work strikes us the more, as we consider that it was St. Peter, to whom was given, with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power (as Bishop Horsley[2] interprets it) of loosing the obligation of the law as to its temporary rites, and binding it as to its moral precepts; and yet, though St. Peter exercised this power of unlocking the gates of the Church and opening them to all mankind, both in that he declared, from the vision revealed to him, that no man of any nation is to be called unclean, unfit for God's service, and in that he was the first to speak in that apostolical council, which released the Gentile converts from the yoke of the ceremonial law, save the precept of blood only,

[1] Gal. i. 15.

[2] This argument of Bishop Horsley will be found in Tertullian, De Pudicitia, c. 21. See Bishop Kaye's Eccles. Hist. illustrated from Tertull. 2d edit. p. 237.

though he thus far fulfilled his office, loosing on earth what shall be counted as loosed in heaven; yet, in no recorded document of his preaching, neither in his discourses related in the Acts, nor even in his Epistles, does he pursue this subject further. He declares, indeed[1], Jesus to be the Christ of whom Moses and the prophets spake; he applies to the Christian Church the titles[2] given to the children of Israel, "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people;" but a single comparison of the blood of Christ to that of the Paschal lamb, is all that he declares of the true relation between the Law and the Gospel. Nor is this subject brought forward in the Epistles either of St. John, or St. James, or St. Jude. To him who once persecuted the Christians for their supposed departure from the law, to St. Paul it has been reserved to unfold this subject in all its bearings, to remove the errors and the prejudices of his countrymen, in which he had himself so largely shared; and by his perfect knowledge of the law, as received by them, to illustrate the faith he once destroyed. And his doctrine forms an admirable commentary on his great Master's words, (words which had

[1] Acts ii. iii. and x. 43; 1 Pet. ii. 9, and i. 19.

[2] Exod. xix. 5, 6.

a further scope than his own personal fulfilment of it during his ministry), "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it."

It is an useful maxim to bear in mind, as we study St. Paul's writings, that of every essential doctrine of religion which is found there, some intimation at least is to be found in the records of our Saviour's ministry. The Gospel[1] of St. Paul and the preaching of Jesus Christ are the same. Resurrection from the grave, through Him who is the Resurrection and the Life; salvation, eternal life, through faith in Him, in Him lifted up on the cross; His ascension to His former glory, and the gifts of the Spirit;—all these are plainly taught in our Lord's discourses: and though his disciples understood them not at the time, yet when they thought upon them, looking back, as we do, from the scenes of Calvary and of Olivet, they understood them, and remembered that He had uttered them, and caused them to be recorded for the instruction of their fellow-Christians. On this account, it seems to me judicious advice to those who read but little, that they read the Gospels, as they are called, rather than St. Paul's Epistles. Not that any

[1] Rom. xvi. 25.

Protestant can desire that any part of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, should not be read by all Christians; but because, if a selection is to be made, these ought to be read first; for though the apostles wrote as the Spirit gave them utterance, there is, and there must be, a greater weight and efficacy in the very words of the Son of God himself: and because the moral tone of his discourses cannot be mistaken; whereas, though the same tone, no doubt, pervades St. Paul's Epistles, it will not always be felt by the ordinary reader, who does not perceive that the apostle is often combating errors which prevailed in those times, to a greater extent than they can be expected to prevail now. In its historical books, the foundation of a knowledge of the New Testament must be laid: there will be found the principles of our religion, which it was Christ's prophetic office to teach: to his apostles he left the work of explaining his doctrines, illustrating what he had taught by what he had accomplished, pointing out the subordination of the Mosaic to the Christian covenant, and declaring the abolition of all those ordinances, the design of which was fulfilled in him.

The abolition of the law, as declared by

St. Paul, it may be convenient to consider, as he was led to speak of it to his countrymen alone, to the Jews in Palestine, and as he was led to speak of it to those Churches, where Jews and Gentiles were united together. In his Epistle to the Hebrews, the native Jews of Palestine, he teaches his countrymen, that to profess the Christian faith, far from being a violation of the law, was to do that which the law itself required; that the whole economy of the Mosaic dispensation pointed to Christ. He beautifully illustrates the benefits of the Christian sacrifice, comparing and contrasting it with the sacrifices of the Levitical priesthood, with that especially offered once a year when the high-priest entered the holy of holies, on the great day of expiation; by the comparison shewing that a reconciliation was thus made to fit true penitents for the service of God; by the contrast arguing the soul-cleansing power of his blood, who through the eternal Spirit, through the will and the power of his own immortal Godhead, offered his human body, himself the priest and the victim, to make atonement for the sins of the world. But while he thus illustrates the Christian scheme, his main argument is to point out to his countrymen, that the sacrifices and ordi-

nances of the Levitical priesthood were designed to be but "figures for the time then present," were designed to be set aside when the Christ should accomplish the great atonement, which these did but faintly shadow. He shews that both *before* the law, by the selection of the tribe, not of Levi, but of Judah, from which the Christ should be born, and *under* the law, by the declaration that he should be a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, it had been signified from of old, that in him the priesthood should be changed; but with the change of the priesthood, argues the apostle, there must of necessity be a change of the law. The change of the law, then, here spoken of, "the disannulling of the commandment for its weakness and unprofitableness," is the disannulling of it as it was connected with the Levitical priesthood, as it sent men to them to make atonement by their sacrifices and offerings: for this purpose the law was weak and unprofitable; this was to be sought by faith only. And indeed, continues he, by faith in God, as he had revealed himself, by this same principle, both the patriarchs before the law, and his faithful servants under the law, have ever pleased him.

In this Epistle, then, to the Jews of Palestine, St. Paul shews them, that if they truly followed the religion of their fathers, they would now become Christians; that the law, as to all its ceremonies and ordinances, its ritual sacrifices and its priesthood, had been designed to be laid aside, when he should come, whose shadows these were; that the Gospel, in short, is the Law fulfilled and perfected in Christ: and thus he declares the ceremonial law to be abolished.

But in his Epistles to those Churches, where Gentiles were mingled with the Jews of the dispersion, the apostle seems to make a stronger contrast, to draw a broader line of distinction between the Jewish covenant and the Christian, between the law of works and the law of faith: and this may strike us the more, because, though in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is the ceremonial law of which he speaks, here he unquestionably speaks of the moral law also. That the national prejudices of the Jews in favour of their law should break forth more strongly when they were brought into contact with the Gentiles, and therefore need a stronger correction, is only what we might have expected. These prejudices rested on

the Scriptures[1], which denounced a curse against those who kept not the statutes and commandments, and promised righteousness and life by these statutes to those who kept them. And however true it may be, that such Scriptural declarations referred to this life only, we cannot be surprised that the Jewish Christians understood them otherwise, and thought, that it should still be their righteousness, if they observed to do all the commandments. Thus they rested their justification on Christ as one ground, and on the law as another. "Except ye be circumcised[2] after the manner of Moses," said they at Antioch, "ye cannot be saved." The earnestness of St. Paul in opposing this doctrine, when it had infected the Church in Galatia, shews that he regarded it as destroying the very essence of our religion. "Behold, I Paul[3] say unto you, if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing:" and again, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law." Both the language of the apostle, and also his own practice on other occasions, shew that it was not the mere compliance with

[1] Levit. xviii. 5; Deut. vi. 25, and xxvii. 26.
[2] Acts xv. [3] Gal. v. 2. 4.

the Jewish ordinances, but the seeking to be justified by them, which he regarded as a departure from the Christian faith. In fact, to imagine that any one, by the most strict observance, either of the ceremonial or the moral law, could deserve to be accounted righteous before God, was to lose sight of Christ, and to reject him as the sole author of salvation. Wherever, then, the apostle found that the Jewish converts had introduced this error into the Church, he opposes it with the most forcible and pointed statements. He tells them, that "we[1] are justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Not that any one can suppose from this, that deeds of virtue, endeavours to acquire religious and moral habits, are less necessary to the Christian than they were to the Jew: but in our endeavours to acquire them, it is our comfort to know, that it is not to our poor, unprofitable services, but to Christ our Saviour, we are to look for our hopes of heaven.

Faith in a rewarding God must necessarily influence the conduct of those who are to be the objects of his rewards: and of such a practical faith St. Paul is here speaking. He de-

[1] Rom. iii. 28.

scribes it as belief with the heart, belief influencing the heart, regulating its feelings and affections, and thereby guiding the conduct. "With the heart," says he, "man believeth unto righteousness [1]." Whatever of duty towards God or man the law enjoins, that and more also a Christian's faith will prompt him to perform; and yet it is not for the practical holiness necessarily springing from faith, that a man is accounted righteous before God, but rather, because to be guided by faith is to have that very frame of mind, which continually seeks to interpose the merits of Christ between our frailties and their just punishment. Not through any deservings of ours, but through His merits and His intercession, if with sincere faith we honestly endeavour to serve Him, our endeavours are accepted in heaven.

To this means of justification in mercy given St. Paul chiefly refers, when he declares, that we "are not [2] under the law, but under grace;" that "we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held." We are set free from the law in that respect in which the law itself intimated it should be displaced by some more gracious

[1] Rom. x. 10. [2] Ibid. vi. 14, and vii. 6.

covenant; "through[1] the law we are dead to the law." Now there is nothing in the law to intimate, but that its moral precepts shall be binding for ever: yet, though it is written there, that "he that doeth all these statutes shall live by them," though it is written, "it shall be our righteousness, if we keep all these commandments," there is much in the law to shew, that men must look to some better and more efficacious means of justification, than could possibly spring from their own obedience to God's commands. The law intimated this, as, by shewing men the extent of their duty, it shewed them their inability to be perfect in all obedience; it intimated this by the evident inefficacy of its ritual sacrifices and purifications as a means to take away sin; but especially it intimated it by its types and prophecies pointing to the blessing through Abraham's promised seed. "The law[2] was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ:" "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness."

As a means of justification then, the law, both moral and ceremonial, was to be laid aside: the Christians were to be taught not to seek to establish their own righteousness,

[1] Gal. ii. 19. [2] Ibid. iii. 24; Rom. x. 4.

by obeying the ceremonial ordinances, nor even the moral precepts of the law, but regulating their lives by faith, which worketh by love, to look through Jesus Christ for that righteousness, which God of his free grace imputes to his true servants, in pardoning all their sin, and not imputing it to them for punishment in the world to come. And here let me observe, that he, who declared the law thus laid aside as powerless to give life and righteousness, St. Paul, had been a Pharisee, one of that sect who were most apt from their strict observance of the law to trust in themselves that they were righteous, and to despise others. He, who knew the evil in its fullest extent, was the chosen instrument to root it out.

As to the civil law, which was given to the Israelites to govern them as a people separate from the rest of the world, it naturally ceased with the cessation of their existence as a peculiar and chosen nation, when the Church of God on earth was made Catholic in Christ, and all of every land were invited to become his Israel. But to separate the Jew from the Gentile world, was the office not so much of the civil as of the ceremonial law; and of this

latter, or perhaps of both, St. Paul speaks, where he says to the Ephesians, "Christ has made both Jew and Gentile one[1], and has broken down the middle wall of partition between them, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments contained in ordinances." He here distinctly points out the separating nature of the law; it is the wall of partition, the enmity: and he calls it the law of commandments in positive ordinances, ἐν δόγμασι, in things right, because they are decreed. These positive ordinances then, whether the ceremonial or the civil law, these are entirely abrogated in Christ, and are no longer of any force at all.

And this is the sum of St. Paul's doctrine on the abolition of the law. The ceremonial and moral law are no longer proposed as the instrument of justification: the ceremonial and civil law are no longer binding on man.

It has, indeed, been supposed that his words have a further meaning, and that he has declared the whole Mosaic law, even its moral precepts, annulled by the Christian covenant. In the beginning of the Reformation a man of

[1] Eph. ii. 14, 15.

eminence in the Lutheran Church, John Agricola[1], maintained that Christians ought to be exhorted to holiness of life on the sublime principles of the Gospel alone, that the moral law of Moses was abrogated as a rule of duty, and that even the ten commandments, having been enacted for the people of Israel, and not for Christians, were now no longer binding. Such was the doctrine of the founder of the sect of Antinomians, though Agricola himself did not fall into the extravagance of his infatuated followers: it is almost unnecessary to add, that Luther strenuously opposed the unsound and unwarranted doctrine.

Nothing was abolished by the Christian covenant but what had been designed from the beginning to last for a season only—the civil law of the Jews ceasing with their national existence—their ceremonies and sacrifices, and their means of justification, all designed to be laid aside at the coming of the true propitiation for sin,—Christ who justifieth. But it is not so with the moral law; the great duties towards God and our neighbour which it enjoins, were our duties before they were commanded from Sinai, and must continue such,

[1] Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. cent. xvi. s. 3. p. 2. c. 1.

though they had never been commanded there: they are right in their own nature, and therefore are of perpetual obligation—but they have a further claim on us, in that God has commanded us to do them: nothing can strip them of what they have once received, the sanction of God's command. Whatever was designed to be temporary, he sanctioned for a season only: whatever was of perpetual obligation, he sanctioned for ever.[1]

[1] So Irenæus, Adv. Hæreses. L. IV. c. 31. "Preparing man for a life of holiness, the Lord himself with his own voice spake the words of the Decalogue alike to all: these commandments, therefore, continue with us, extended and enlarged, not abolished by his coming in the flesh. But the ordinances of bondage he gave to the people separately by the voice of Moses, as Moses himself says, 'And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments.' These, then, which were given as a yoke of bondage, and as a sign to them, he has blotted out by the new covenant of liberty. But what are natural, and becoming men who are free, and common to all, these commandments he has enlarged and extended, ungrudgingly, bountifully granting to men through their adoption to know God as their Father, and to love him with all their heart, and without unwillingness to follow his word, abstaining not from evil deeds alone, but even from the desire of them."

This extract has been taken from Irenæus, merely to shew *generally* what he thought of our obligation to keep the ten commandments: any conjectures, what he may

Hence our Church, adopting the ten commandments into her Liturgy, continually reminds us, that "God spake these words." I am aware that a question may be made how far what I have said is applicable to the fourth commandment: this question for the present I will pass by, and make it the subject of a separate discourse. But as to the rest—to worship God alone, to worship him as he has declared himself, not degrading his Majesty to the likeness of any thing our hands have framed, or our minds have conceived, never to mention his name but with reverence; and as to our fellow-creatures, to honour our parents and all who stand in place of parents to us, to check the resentful and the lustful passions, to harm no one in his person, or in his family, or in his property, or in his reputation, nor even to covet any thing which in any of these ways would be another's harm,—all these every one must perceive to be our duty as soon as they are stated, however necessary the law may have been to point them out at first, and to give mankind a knowledge of sin. It may be said, indeed, that the principles and

have thought of the duty required by the fourth commandment, it seems better to reserve till that subject is before us.

dispositions implanted in a sincere Christian will lead him to perform all these duties without reference to the Decalogue; and so it might be said, that every true Israelite, who had learned to love God with all his heart, mind, soul, and strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, from these principles and dispositions would have performed all that the two great commandments, inculcating them, briefly comprehend; the only difference is, that these same principles and dispositions (prompting both Jew and Christian alike to keep the Decalogue, because they are God's commands) in a Christian are, or ought to be, more strongly excited and called into action, in proportion to our clearer knowledge of God, and ampler revelation of his wondrous mercies.

I am not contending that it is to the Decalogue the perfect Christian is to look for the rule of his duty, when he has learned from the higher principles of faith and love to keep these commandments, as our Lord has taught us, not in the letter but in the spirit; when he bears them thus written on the fleshy tables of his heart, he need no longer look to them as they were written for the Israelites of old on tables of stone. I only contend that it

cannot be argued from this, that the moral law is no longer binding on Christians. Laws, we know, are made to restrain the bad; the good are good from principle: yet, though the good are kept in their duty, not by the curb of the law, but by the sway of principle, no one surely will argue, that with them the laws are of no force, and are not binding on them.

St. Paul teaches us another language on the obligation of the Decalogue: he exhorts the Church at Rome [1] to the love of our neighbours as oneself, for the express reason, that this is a summary of the whole of the second table of the Ten Commandments; he declares, that the commandment is holy, and just, and good [2], that by it alone he had learned that the mere thought of lust, though not allowed to shew itself in deed or even in word, is of itself a sin. "I had not known lust (to be sin) except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." This is not the language of one who thought that law no longer binding. But it may be said, it is one thing to acknowledge the force of the law, another to urge it as a motive for a Christian's conduct. If it be doubted whether St. Paul has done this in the instances already given, I will bring forward another,

[1] Rom. xiii. 9. [2] Ibid. vii. 7. 12

which cannot be questioned, and which is the more striking, because, from the reference the commandment makes to Canaan, some might suppose it addressed to Jews only. "Children[1]," says he, "obey your parents, for this is right," δίκαιον, according to the law. He then quotes the fifth commandment; and whether, by calling it the first commandment with promise, he means that it is the first of the second table, or the first to which a promise is annexed, in either case, especially in the latter, he distinctly acknowledges the rest of the Decalogue. That St. Paul brings forward this commandment to teach children only their duty, is no argument against its obligation on all ages alike, but seems to tell us, that though they, who have made some progress in putting on the Christian character, are to be exhorted to continue in their duty towards God, and for his sake, towards man, from a sense of his wondrous love revealed in the Gospel; still God's own words in the Decalogue, binding as they are, and must be, on all, are a wholesome remembrance to those who are children in Christian knowledge and in Christian practice, as well as to those who are children in age.

And let it not be thought that the argument

[1] Ephes. ii. 1, 2.

for the obligation of the commandments of the first table is less complete, because they are not explicitly detailed in the New Testament. It was not the law of our duty to God, but that of our duty to our neighbour, which they whom our Saviour addressed were most apt to evade. They were zealous for sacrifice, but neglected mercy—they were zealous for the services of religion, but neglected to consider, that religion, to be pure and undefiled, must influence a man in all his dealings with the world. The commandments, then, which guide us here, were enforced and explained. But the New Testament fully recognizes those of the first table also, as they are briefly comprehended in that first and great commandment[1], "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." The Ten Commandments, then, are acknowledged in the Gospel; and there we are taught to keep them, not in the letter, but in the spirit; nor can any Christian man be free from obedience to them, since they are God's own words.

I cannot close this review of St. Paul's doctrine concerning the law, how far it is abo-

[1] Matt. xxii.

lished, and how far it is still binding on Christians, without again calling attention to some points in his previous character, as connected with the office he was chosen to perform. He who was marked above his countrymen, both for his knowledge of the Mosaic law and for his zealous attachment to it,—he had to declare their ceremonial and civil law altogether abolished and repealed. He who, as a Pharisee, had been taught to look for righteousness by a blameless observance of the law,—he had to declare, that no observance of the law, either ceremonial or moral, can give life or righteousness to man. His preaching must have been with a peculiar weight and power—one so learned in Moses' law, shewing from that law itself, that it was designed to be laid aside—one so blameless in the righteousness which was by its ordinances, declaring his desire not to be found in that righteousness, but in the righteousness which is of God by faith. The zeal with which he had once embraced the errors of his countrymen on these subjects, was a proof of the sincerity of the conviction which moved him to reject and to refute them: and none, surely, could be more fit to inculcate the obligation of all the moral precepts of Moses' law, than he who, at the time of his own conversion,

both in his meditation during his blindness at Damascus, and in his contemplative retirement into Arabia, must often have felt how great a blessing it was, that from that law he had ever accustomed himself to regulate his conduct, his thoughts, and desires, by a sense of duty to God; that he had not then to form anew habits of holiness, but in this respect had only to go onwards, and advance in his course of moral duty, with a better light to shew his path, and a more glorious haven to cheer its close. Whoever[1] shall do the will of God, shall know of the Christian doctrine that it is from him: we read in the Gospel, of the rich young man[2] who had kept all the commandments from his youth up, that Jesus loved him; and the prayers and the alms of Cornelius went up before God, to bring down a rich reward in the blessing of his conversion: and who shall say, but that, in the case of St. Paul also, his diligent obedience to God's commandments when a Jew, may have had a share in drawing upon him those signal marks of Heaven's favour—the special miracles for his conversion, the glorious visions and revelations of the Lord for his instruction in the Gospel, by

[1] John vii. 17. [2] Mark x.

which, when a Christian, he came "not[1] a whit behind the very chiefest apostles?" Let us, then, as we seek to please God, diligently strive to follow St. Paul in that steady and severe obedience to the moral commandments in which he uniformly walked: but yet more, let us be followers of him, as he was a true follower of the preaching of Jesus Christ.

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 5.

SERMON IV.

THE LORD'S DAY
THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

GEN. ii. 2, 3.

On the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work, which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.

THE institution of the Sabbath, each seventh day sanctified to God's service, according to the plain and obvious meaning of this Scripture, is coeval with the creation of the world. It has, indeed, been asserted, that this is not so, that the Sabbath was not instituted till the times of Moses, and that he was led here [1], by the connection of the subject alone, to mention its sanctification as a day of rest for the chil-

[1] Paley's Moral Philos. B. V. c. 7.

dren of Israel: and, however forced and unnatural this construction may appear, yet as the opinion, in support of which it is brought forward, is said to have prevailed very generally among the early writers of the Christian Church, it may be well to examine the grounds on which the opinion stands.

Now it is urged, that in the book of Genesis there is no further mention of any Sabbath; and though it is allowed, that there is reason for this omission in the brief history of the world before the call of Abraham, a history of a period of more than two thousand years, condensed into the space of ten short chapters, yet it is argued, that the total silence respecting it, if it had been then kept as a religious day, is quite unaccountable in the circumstantial and domestic memoirs of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with his family. No argument is more fallacious, than to infer that a practice did not exist, because we do not find it mentioned where we think we might have expected it. In the history of those times, when all acknowledge the law of the Sabbath to have been observed, we still find the same silence. It is not mentioned in Joshua, in Judges, in Ruth, in either of the books of Samuel, or in the first book of Kings:

and it will be allowed here, that the history of Saul and of David, at least, is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic to have introduced some occasion to notice it; and on the seven days' siege of Jericho, surely, or the seven days in which Saul waited for Samuel in Gilgal, or the twice seven days' feast on the dedication of Solomon's temple, we might have expected some mention of the Sabbath: but even on the restoration of the public worship after the Babylonish captivity, we find no mention of it in Ezra, except as it is included in the general expression, "all their set feasts;" nor yet in Nehemiah, except in the Levites' grateful commemoration of God's early mercies towards their nation, till it is introduced by the apprehension and the fact of a temptation to break its holy rest by the people, who, in their absence, had settled in the land. Since, then, we read, in the beginning of Genesis, that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, the correct inference, from the subsequent silence respecting the Sabbath in that book, is, that the day was constantly observed, its holy services regularly performed by all God's true worshippers, that nothing occurred in the lives of those recorded for our imitation to interrupt

or disturb their uniform discharge of the sacred duty.

Nor does the book of Exodus at all confirm the opinion of the Mosaic institution of the Sabbath. The fourth commandment, indeed, gives a most solemn sanction to the observance of the day, and enjoins on it a total cessation from labour; a rest, probably, of greater strictness than had been observed before; but far from establishing it as a new thing, it speaks of it as already established and known. "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy."—"For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." The natural inference, surely, from these words is, that the time of the creation and the time of the blessing were the same.

In fact, we are distinctly told, that the Sabbath was kept by the children of Israel before the delivery of the commandments from Sinai[1], when manna first was given: and since, to prove the Sabbath instituted by Moses, this has been supposed the occasion of its institu-

[1] Exod. xvi.

tion, it is necessary to enquire, what reason there is for the supposition.

When the Lord declared to Moses, in the wilderness of Sin, that he would give his people their daily bread from heaven, he commanded them to prepare that which they should bring in on the sixth day, and promised that it should be twice as much as they should gather on any other. Without any mention of the Sabbath, here was a command to prepare for it, as if it, the reason of the commanded preparation, had been well known. And accordingly, when the people, on the sixth day, told Moses of their double portions, he said to them, "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord," and again, "Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, the Sabbath, ye shall find none." And when some yet went out on the Sabbath-day, and found none, "the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord *hath given* you the Sabbath, therefore he *giveth* you on the sixth day the bread of two days:—let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." Observe here, while it is said, "He *giveth* you the bread," though this was given the day before,

it is said, "He *hath given* you the Sabbath," as if speaking of what had been done in times long past. And though it be admitted, that the distinction in the original between the past tense and the participle, which here expresses the present, rests only on the traditionary, but universally-received, interpretation of the Jews, yet it must be allowed, that there is in Exodus a marked difference between the first mention of the Sabbath, and that of any of the Jewish feasts then confessedly first instituted.

To me, indeed, there appears a strong presumption that the division of time into[1] weeks (and we should remember it was after an interval of a week on each occasion, that the dove was thrice sent from the ark) and consequently its cause, the hallowed observance of each seventh day, had been maintained, so far as circumstances allowed, by God's faithful servants from the very beginning of time: for on no other supposition is it easy to collect from the Scriptures, that the Jewish Sabbath (supposing the day not to have been changed on account of their deliverance from Egypt, of which change I see no evidence whatever) was truly the weekly return of the seventh

[1] Gen. viii. and Gen. xxix. 27. comp. Judges xiv. 12.

day of that first and glorious week, on which the great Creator rested from "His six-days' work, a world." It was, I conceive, on the beginning of this day of holy rest, that the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness of Sin; and that evening when God promised them bread from heaven, and that morning when the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud, followed, as the day closed, by a supply of food[1] at the very doors of their tents, the quails that covered the camp, that evening and morning were the Sabbath-day, after which they were to go out of the camp to gather manna on the face of the wilderness, their six-days' work, continually, till they should enter the land of Canaan.

And that the Sabbath was kept from the beginning, we know on the authority of St. Paul. From the closing words of that Psalm, so familiar to us all as constantly used in our daily service, declaring that the disobedient should not enter into God's rest, St. Paul in

[1] The quails, indeed, are said to have come up at even: but, though the Sabbath was kept from even to even, we know from Nehem. xiii. 19, it was dark before the Sabbath began, and therefore was dark before it closed. The manna was not to fall till the following morning.

his[1] Epistle to the Hebrews argues, that because the rest there mentioned could not have been either that of the Sabbath, or that of the land of Canaan, there remaineth, therefore, another and a better rest for the people of God in the life to come. His argument, that it could not have been the rest of the Sabbath-day, is this; the Holy Ghost saith, "They shall not enter into my rest;" although, continues the Apostle, the works were finished from the foundation of the world; for the Holy Ghost has spoken of the seventh day thus, "And God did rest the seventh day from all his works." The argument then is, that his faithful and obedient servants had entered into and enjoyed the holy rest of his sabbaths from the beginning of the world. And this, we should observe, he does not think it necessary to state formally to the Jews, but he appeals to it in the course of his argument, as a fact already known and universally acknowledged amongst them.

It is clear then, on the authority of St. Paul, that the Sabbath was kept, the holy rest of the seventh day was given by God to his people, from the foundation of the world: a truth

[1] Heb. iv.

which I have sought to establish, because it must have great influence in determining a question of more importance to us, namely, how far the fourth commandment is binding on Christians at the present day. For if the Sabbath were merely appointed as a part of those ordinances, which were to pave the way for the Christian covenant, it must be admitted, that it has been abolished with other such parts of the law, and, with the old things, has passed away;—but if it had been instituted long before, and arose from an event in which all mankind at all times are equally concerned, if it be found bottomed in some degree on the very nature of the event, which occasioned its institution, so far from having passed away with the designedly transitory covenant given to Moses, the obligation to keep it, in such degree at least, as it is so grounded, must remain unchangeable, as is the past event on which it rests.

Now that the Decalogue is binding on Christians, unless some valid reason can be brought for excepting any part of it, I shewed in my last discourse. But it is said, that the other duties there commanded are moral duties, such as would arise from the nature of the case, though there had been no command:

whereas to keep holy each seventh day, it is alleged, is a positive duty, a duty arising from the command only, there being nothing in the nature of the case to call for that particular act. This point seems to deserve, and to demand, further consideration.

Bishop Horsley, in his admirable sermons on this subject, admits, what must be admitted by all, that to assemble ourselves together for public worship at stated seasons, is a moral duty; but when he adds, that no natural sanctity of the seventh day moves us to assemble on it rather than on the sixth or eighth, he does not fairly state the question; and the implied inference, that there is nothing of a moral nature in the duty of hallowing each seventh day, is not consistent with his own forcible remarks in the last of those sermons; viz. "that by keeping one day in seven we protest against idolatry and acknowledge *that* God who in the beginning made the heavens and the earth;" and again, "that the propriety of this protestation against heathenism binds the worshippers of the true God in all ages to a weekly Sabbath."

I regard this duty, indeed, as a positive duty, because I understand the words of my text as a blessing and sanctification of each

seventh day thenceforward for ever, and regard them, therefore, (and so I believe they are usually regarded) as a command to Adam, and in him to all his descendants, to keep holy each seventh day; for God no otherwise sanctifies a day than by making his reasonable creatures keep it holy; still on this view, the institution of a Sabbath is marked above all other positive institutions, as the first command of God to man. But it may be said, that the seventh day, which God then blessed and sanctified, was only the last day of the glorious week of creation; and, if this be so, its sanctification was a command, not so much to our first parents, formed but the day before, as to the angels, to celebrate first in heaven that great seventh day, when the foundations[1] of the earth having been laid, and its finishing corner-stone fastened, the hosts of Cherubim and Seraphim, bright as morning stars, sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. If this interpretation (which certainly is the most literal, and is the only admissible one, if that of a command to our first parents be rejected; for that mankind enjoyed the holy rest of the seventh day from the found-

[1] Job xxxviii. 6, 7.

ation of the world, is clear on the authority of St. Paul;) if this be the correct interpretation, I argue, that to keep the Sabbath seems to have the nature of a moral duty. The precise meaning of Scriptural expressions, which speak of particular occasions of holy rejoicing in heaven, where all is holy joy, I pretend not to explain; but the design of employing such expressions is sufficiently obvious, viz. that such may be occasions of holy joy on earth. And the heavenly rejoicing on that seventh day, when the creation was finished, seems to have been made known for this end alone, that we also, on the return of each seventh day, may rejoice before the Lord, and praise the great Creator. Our knowledge that the world was created in six days, teaches us to think aright of the stupendous power of him who made it: but our knowledge of the hallowed close of the glorious work gives us but little instruction concerning the Almighty: it was communicated then for another end, to instruct us in our duty towards him. And surely every good and reasonable man, on receiving this knowledge, would naturally be moved to imitate the holy rejoicing of the angelic host, and on the return of each seventh day consecrate it to acts of devotion, in order

to preserve in his heart a continual sense of the wondrous work,—this vast, firm, and seemingly imperishable earth, with all thereon, created in six days by the word of Him whom we worship. Moral obligation may arise as naturally from knowledge communicated by revelation, as from that we acquire in any other way. It is observed by Bishop Butler[1], that to worship the Son and the Holy Ghost, the relation in which They stand to us having been once made known in the Scriptures, is as clearly a moral duty as to worship God the Father, though the relation He stands in to us is made known by our reason. And thus also a moral obligation to hallow each seventh day arises from the revealed account of the creation. In the language of Bishop Horsley, there is a propriety in the practice which binds all worshippers of the true God in all ages to keep it.

It will not, I trust, for a moment be supposed that I adopt the extravagant doctrine of those fanatics who, towards the close of Queen Elizabeth's reign, taught that the violation of the Sabbath is as great[2] a sin as adul-

[1] Analogy of Relig. Nat. and Rev., Part II. c. 1.

[2] Strype's Life of Archbishop Whitgift, B. IV. c. 25.

tery or murder: of our moral duties, some are more evident than others; to commit an act of theft, for instance, or of adultery, is more evidently sinful than merely to covet or desire; and the guilt of violating any moral duty must be greater or less, in proportion to the clearness of this evidence. But I am persuaded that, had there not been a fear of countenancing these Sabbatarian notions, men in general would have been ready to acknowledge the morality of keeping holy each seventh day, to acknowledge a propriety in the duty, which, independent of any express command, naturally arises from knowledge apparently revealed for this very end.

Such being the real nature of the duty of hallowing each seventh day, it follows that the command from Sinai, which sanctions it, must be as unchangeable as the other precepts of the Decalogue with which it is numbered,—must be as lasting as man's interest in the glorious event, to commemorate which it was given.

"The moral law," says Hooker, "requiring a seventh part, throughout the age of the world, to be that way employed, although with us the day be changed in regard of a new revelation begun by our Saviour Christ: yet the same proportion of time continueth which

was before, because, in reference to the benefit of Creation, and now much more of renovation thereunto added by Him, which was Prince of the world to come, we are bound to account the sanctification of one day in seven a duty which God's immutable law doth exact for ever[1]."

[1] Eccles. Polity, V. s. 70. In the above argument, the necessity of appointing some particular day for the public services of religion has been assumed. A daily public worship, however, is, I believe, sometimes supposed to be pointed out * as a Christian's duty at the close of Isaiah's prophecy. The expression indeed, "the new heavens and the new earth," may be truly interpreted of Christ's kingdom in its commencement on earth, though it is applied both by St. Peter and St. John, (2 Pet. iii. 13. and Rev. xxi. 1.) to His kingdom of glory; and yet the blessing of his Church "that from one Sabbath to another all flesh shall come to worship before me," seems rather to refer to its future state; as we know, on the highest authority, the sentence against transgressors, in the following verse, refers to the future state of the impenitent. Private (and in this word I would include domestic) prayer every day has, in all ages, been the constant practice of all faithful members of the Church of God: but the Prophet seems to speak of assembling every day in the Lord's especial presence for public worship; and, though we must needs believe this duty truly performed in the eternal Sabbath in heaven, it is a duty, which here on earth, to men in general, the calls of their several stations render impracticable; and unless

* Grot. de Ver. Rel. Christ. L. V. c. 10.

But admitting that the fourth commandment is binding on Christians, it is asked on what authority the day is changed, and the first, instead of the seventh, day of the week kept as the Christian Sabbath, in a professed obedience to this command. The authority is no other than that of Christ himself. On the evening of the day of his resurrection, as the disciples were assembled together for holy meditation, he came and stood in the midst of them: and though afterwards, for a month, he went continually in and out amongst them, yet now, not shewing himself the six[1] following

some stated days be set apart for the purpose, the sacred service could never be fitly performed. The institution of a Sabbath was an accommodation to the wants and weakness of man—the Sabbath was made for man.

[1] This point, which appears to have escaped the notice of former commentators, as far as may be judged by Poole's Synopsis of their remarks, I find first noticed by Bishop Horsley, who says, "It was, perhaps, to set a mark of distinction upon this day in particular, that the intervening week passed off, *as it should seem*, without any repetition of this first visit to the eleven Apostles." Why he speaks doubtfully, I do not understand, as St. John, proceeding to relate the appearance of Jesus to his disciples on the sea of Tiberias, distinctly tells us, that this was the third time he shewed himself to his disciples; regarding, evidently, as one, the several times of his appearing on the day of his resurrection, (and, in fact, he appeared but once on this day to his assembled disciples), and his appearing on the

days, as if to mark the case, after eight days, that is, on the eighth day, the first day of the week, when the disciples had again met together, the Lord of the Sabbath again was there, and sanctioned the religious observance of the day by his blessed presence. And on the first day of the week also, the day of Pentecost, he shed forth on the assembled Christians the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, the great promise to the Christian Church, and the earnest of her continual enjoyment of his gracious help and guidance. Now, bound as we are to praise God in his greatness for the

eighth day, as the second. The point is the more striking, when we consider that the whole interval between the resurrection and ascension was but forty days. It was in Galilee, indeed, that, according to his promise, he went continually in and out amongst them; and it may be said (for it seems probable from the account) that on the eighth day from the resurrection, the Apostles were still at Jerusalem: they were again within, and the door was shut, as before, for fear of the Jews; but unless it was designed, by their again assembling there on the weekly return of the resurrection-day, to mark the interval between Christ's first and second appearing, it is difficult to allege a reason why they should so long have tarried at Jerusalem, when both the angels at the tomb, and Christ himself, had distinctly charged the holy women, to whom he first appeared, to tell his disciples, that they should go into Galilee, and *there* should see him.

creation of all around us, yet more are we Christians bound to praise him in his goodness for the assurance given on the first day of the week, of our redemption and of our sanctification, the pledge of that new heavens and new earth, which the Lord creates for his people.

It cannot be supposed but that the disciples assembled together for public worship both on the Sabbath next after the resurrection, and on that before the day of Pentecost: it had been their Master's constant custom to go into the places of public worship on the Sabbath days; yet not to their religious assembly on the Sabbath, but to that on the first day of the week, in both instances, the assurance of the great blessings of the Christian covenant was given; and by this remarkable preference of the first day of the week, Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, raised it in honour above the seventh, and blessed it as the one day in seven hereafter to be set apart more especially for the public worship of the Almighty. I do not mean that from this time forward Christians regarded the duty enjoined in the fourth commandment fulfilled by their devotional exercises on the Lord's day; such could not have been the case while the ancient Sabbath was yet observed; and that was not altogether abolished,

at least, with the Christians who dwelt at Jerusalem, till the whole national polity of the Jews was overthrown in the destruction of their city and their Temple: "Pray," says our Lord to his disciples, in reference to that event, "pray[1] that your flight be not on the Sabbath-day."

The practice of St. Paul, in going continually into the synagogues on the Sabbath days, does not throw much light on this part of our enquiry: for if, on the one hand, his declarations[2], that we are not bound to a Jewish ob-

[1] Matt. xxiv. 20.

[2] In the Epistle to the Galatians, written A.D. 52, the observance of days, that is, of Jewish Sabbaths, is censured; —in that to the Romans, written the following year, according to Dr. Burton, it is treated as a matter indifferent in itself, and in which a man was to be guided by his conscience. But the Galatian Church appears to have been infected with the error, which had before spread among the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, that to keep the law of Moses was necessary to salvation; and, therefore, St. Paul is earnest to oppose a doctrine which led them to rest their hopes of heaven on other foundation than what is laid in the great atonement. Where, however, the observance of the law was unconnected with this error, the prejudices of the Jews were allowed gradually to wear away; and, upon these considerations, we find no difficulty in reconciling St. Paul's declarations to the Galatians (iv. 10, 11. and v. 2.) with his declarations to the Romans, (xiv. 5, 6. and ii. 25.) and with

servance of days, and that we are not to be judged in respect of the Sabbaths, shew clearly, that his only object was to lay hold of the opportunity thus afforded him, to attempt the conversion of the Jews, and of the devout Greeks, who had adopted their custom; on the

his own compliance with the law, (Acts xvi. 3. and xxi. 26). The Epistle to the Colossians was written about four years after that to the Romans; but we should observe, what is there said of the Sabbaths seems to be addressed to Gentile converts. A passage, however, from the Epistle to the Romans, to which we have referred (xiv. 5, 6.), is sometimes brought forward to shew that Christians are under no obligation to keep any Sabbath-day at all. That the words, if they apply to Jewish festivals as well as fasts, apply to Christian festivals also, I allow, but would observe, that the distinction there made is not between keeping one day in the week or none, but between keeping one or every day thus consecrated. It was shortly after writing this very Epistle, that St. Paul abode seven days at Philippi to preach to the disciples there, as they assembled on the first day of the week for the holy communion: and the fact, that this day was distinguished above others as the Lord's day, must be borne in mind when we read any thing that seems to bear against such distinction of days. The doctrine in Romans xiv. may be thus applied: One man thinks Sunday holy (v. 14.) in itself; another thinks all days alike holy in themselves, and that Sunday is called holy only as being especially appointed for holy acts: each is guided by what he believes to be the will of God, to whom alone in this matter we are answerable.

other hand, it must be confessed, that his practice gave a sanction to the continued observance of the day with them. In many places, then, it appears, that the ancient Sabbath continued to be observed during much of the life of St. Paul; yet it cannot be inferred from this, that Christ himself did not substitute the day of his resurrection in its room, as the day to be especially kept holy for God's service. We learn, from the Acts of the Apostles[1], that many thousands of Jews who believed were for a long time zealous of the law, and (as may be gathered from the context) circumcised their children; and that they did so without prejudice to their faith as Christians, may be concluded from the fact, that St. Paul, on hearing of the practice, instead of checking it, himself complied with the law: yet no one will deny that Christ abolished circumcision, and substituted baptism in its room, as the rite of admission into the Church of God. In both these cases it beautifully illustrates the wise and forbearing spirit of our religion, that time was allowed for the Jews gradually to divest themselves of the sentiments which had sprung up from a reverence for the inspired records.

[1] Acts xxi. 20, 21.

When the ancient Sabbath was laid aside in the several parts of the Christian Church, cannot easily be determined with precision: but whenever and wherever the observance of it was discontinued, the primitive Christians must have remembered how the first day of the week had been preferred in honour above the seventh by Christ himself, and on this authority have regarded the fourth commandment really obeyed by continuing to assemble together for public worship on the Lord's day.

Such is the impression which all naturally receive, who have been taught to keep holy the Lord's day, and to venerate the commandments. And it seems to me no confusion of thought, but the correct and the common view of the case, to regard Sunday as the first day of the week, when we regard it as a remembrancer of the blessings of the Christian covenant; as the seventh, when we regard it as a remembrancer of the world's creation. As long as we set apart each seventh day for this purpose, it matters not to us, whether the time has been exactly computed from Adam: the received day, indeed, was not to be lightly changed; but to the Christian there has been ample reason for the change, and ample sanc-

tion; and we commemorate each Lord's day the original purpose of the Sabbath: no reason can be assigned for the *weekly* return of the festival but what is founded on this; from this arose the very division of time into weeks; that division was not the usage of ancient Greece with her tripartite months; it was not the usage of ancient Rome, with her nones and ides and calends, till from the numerical coincidence, the seven days were named from the seven planets, according to the system[1] confirmed by Ptolemy, and this connection with astronomy made the use of weeks general throughout the Roman empire about the reign of the elder Antonine. The *weekly* celebration, then, of the Lord's day is, in spirit and in truth, a celebration of the Sabbath.

And scanty as the evidence is, which the Scriptures afford on this subject, yet confirmed as it is by the subsequent practice of the Church, it is enough to establish a reasonable ground for believing, that on the Lord's day Christians used to meet together for public

[1] The Latin names for the days of the week are evidently adopted from the Ptolemaic system, placing the sun first, and then taking his inferior planets alternately with his superior ones in their order, beginning with those nearest the supposed centre, the earth.

worship from the beginning. On the evening of the day itself, we know, the disciples were gathered together, and were discoursing of his resurrection, before he appeared amongst them; and can it be supposed, that they thought of his promise to appear again, without a prayer that it might be realized, or that they heard of its realization in his appearing to Simon, without thanksgiving to God that this was so? Can it be supposed that these things, followed as they were by his own blessed presence, were forgotten by them as they again assembled on the weekly return of the day, or that they were remembered without an offering of prayer and of praise? And if, on the day of Pentecost, they had not come together for Christian devotion, this would be the only instance in the New Testament, in which the gifts of the Holy Spirit were poured on man not so engaged. Afterwards it is mentioned, as if it were the custom of the Christians at Troas to meet together on the first day[1] of the week, for the purpose of celebrating the holy Communion. "On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them." On all other occasions

[1] Acts xx 7.

where St. Paul is mentioned as instructing members of the Christian Church, it appears, that he gathered them[1] together, and they came by his appointment: but here they seem to have assembled of their own accord, as if it had been their custom to receive the Communion on that day: and since we are distinctly told, that St. Paul abode at Troas seven days, and was to depart on the morrow, it is but reasonable to infer, that he had waited there for the purpose of preaching to this religious assembly. Again, charitable collections for the poor, which we learn in the succeeding age formed part of the Sunday's duty, were appointed to be made on the first day[2] of the week, by the Churches of Galatia and Corinth. At a later period, after the Jewish Sabbath had been wholly abrogated in the destruction of Jerusalem, the day, on which St. John being in the Spirit received the Apocalyptic vision, is distinguished by the name[3] of the Lord's day. Except the day had been religiously observed, it would not have been thus marked by its appropriate name—a name, which seems to imply that

[1] Acts xiv. 27; xv. 30; xix. 9; xx. 17.
[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. [3] Rev. i. 10.

the ancient Sabbath was no longer the peculiarly holy day of the Lord our God.

As we turn from the Sacred Canon to cotemporary writers, or to those of the next succeeding ages, we find that in the Primitive Church the Lord's day was regarded as substituted in the room of the Jewish Sabbath; that this day alone was weekly observed as a festival by the Church in general, whatever might have been the practice of some very few in early times, or of the Eastern Church in a later age; and that it was observed, so far as circumstances allowed, as a holy day, appropriated to the public worship of the Almighty. But in entering on this part of my subject, we must bear in mind, that, as in the New Testament, so in the early Christian writers also, the seventh day alone is called the Sabbath, our Sabbath being called the Lord's day, or the first day in the week, or the eighth day, from that eighth day on which Christ again appeared to grace the first weekly commemoration of his resurrection day.

We learn from the celebrated letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan [1], that the Christians

[1] Some say they received the Sacrament at this early meeting, as was done in Tertullian's time, and that they met afterwards for the Agape or feast of Charity.—Soliti

of Bithynia were wont, on a certain fixed day, to meet as it began to dawn, and to sing in concert together an hymn to Christ, as God. If it had been their custom to meet on two consecutive days, the narrator would not have spoken of a certain day as fixed for the purpose; the declared object of their meeting, to worship Christ at the very hour of his resurrection, marks the day, on which they met, as the Lord's day; and it further appears from Pliny's account, that after this early morning service they again assembled to receive the holy Communion. From the apostolical Father Ignatius, we derive no information indeed on the manner in which this day was passed; but there is a passage in his Epistle[1] to the

stato die (not, statis diebus) ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento obstringere—quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum.

[1] For our knowledge of Ignatius's Epistles, we are chiefly indebted to Archbishop Usher and Isaac Vossius; the former of whom, in 1642, edited an ancient Latin version of them from two manuscripts, then discovered in this country, and by it, in an edition two years afterwards, detected many of the interpolations in the formerly received Greek copy; the latter, in 1646, first brought to light the correct Greek text from MSS., in the Library of the Medicis at Florence. The passage I have referred to,

Magnesians, which, according to the ancient and received translation, describes even the

according to the Florentine copy, runs thus: Οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλυθον, μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν διὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανατοῦ αὐτοῦ; and the words, bearing on the question before us, are thus rendered in the ancient Latin version, "Non amplius sabbatizantes, sed secundum Dominicam viventes, in quâ et vita nostra orta est per ipsum et mortem ipsius;" and in a version adapted to the Florentine copy by Archbishop Usher, "non amplius sabbatum colentes, sed juxta Dominicam vitam agentes." The Greek text too, of the interpolated copy in use before Vossius's edition, is,—ἑορταζέτω πᾶς φιλόχριστος τὴν κυριακὴν, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλε. Archbishop Wake, also, here translates κυριακὴν the Lord's day. Yet, notwithstanding all this weight of authority, and any objection which may be raised from the clause, the simple and obvious sense of which probably led to this interpretation of the word κυριακὴν, I believe Ignatius is speaking not of Jews converted to Christianity, but of prophets of old foreseeing, in the spirit, the day of Christ, and thereby not *superstitiously* keeping the Sabbaths, but conforming their lives to His.

If, however, this be the true interpretation of the passage, it will throw considerable light on the language of the Fathers concerning the Patriarchal age. It is probable that they intended only to declare that there was no sabbatism with the Patriarchs, as Ignatius here declares there was no sabbatism with the enlightened Prophets, who yet, as they are said to have lived after the pattern of

converted Jews as "no longer keeping the Sabbaths, but living in the observance of the Lord's day, in which our life also arose through him and his death:" whether Ignatius in this passage intended to speak of the Lord's day, may however be questioned; I therefore only call attention to his doctrine, that the Jewish Sabbath was not to be kept by the Christian Church, and proceed to a surer witness that the Lord's day was in these times substituted in its room. In the Catholic Epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, and quoted as his by Clement of Alexandria, and by Origen, a work unquestionably of high antiquity, and read in some Churches of old together with the sacred Canon itself; in this Epistle of the Apostle Barnabas, after declaring, that the account of the six days' creation, and the seventh day of rest, is an intimation, that after six thousand years the Lord will bring all things to an end, and enter on his glorious rest, (a declaration which I only bring forward to shew that I do not strain what follows from its true meaning,) the author proceeds in the words of the Lord from Isaiah's prophecy, "Your new moons and

Christ's life, must be understood to have regularly attended the holy convocation, as His custom was, every Sabbath day.

your Sabbaths I cannot away with: consider," adds he, "what the Lord means by this; the Sabbaths, says He, which ye now keep are not acceptable to Me, but those which I have made, when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world[1]: for which cause also, we keep as a festival the eighth day, in which Jesus rose from the dead." The primitive Church, then, kept holy the eighth day, the Lord's day, because he would not have the former Sabbaths, but those which he had made. The nation of the Jews having at this time been dispersed abroad, (for the Epistle was written after the fall of Jerusalem) the abolition of their Sabbath, and the Christian celebration of the Lord's day as a holy festival in its stead, are here expressly declared; and this day is spoken of, like the Jewish Sabbaths of old, as a type of the eternal Sabbath in heaven.

The earliest account we have of the form of

[1] The important words of the passage above cited, are—*ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀγδόης ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστι ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχήν· διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν.*—Barnab. Ep. Cath. s. XI. For the genuineness of this Epistle, see note (A) at the end of this Sermon.

public worship on the Lord's day, is in Justin Martyr's first Apology, addressed to the Antonines. He tells them, that all Christians, whether dwelling in cities or in the country, used to assemble together every Sunday; that in these congregations the Scriptures of the New or of the Old Testament were read, after which practical sermons were preached; that they then stood up to join in prayer and thanksgiving, and all received the holy Communion, the minister praying aloud, according to his power, and the people assenting by an Amen to his prayers; and that a collection of alms for the needy was made by the communicants, and given to the minister to distribute at his discretion [1]. Justin adds, that Sunday was thus

[1] The passage, above referred to, from Justin's first Apology for the Christians, is near the end of that work; a translation of it, however, is given by Bishop Kaye, in his account of Justin's writings; it is also quoted in the *Homily of Common Prayer and Sacrament.* The extract from Dionysius's Epistle may be seen in Dr. Routh's Reliquiæ Sacræ, Vol. I. p. 168, or in Whitby's Commentary on 1 Cor. xvi. 2. It is much to be regretted, that a Treatise on the Lord's day, by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, cotemporary with Dionysius, has been lost. We may observe, Justin, writing to heathen emperors, calls the days of the week by their heathen names, and so does Tertullian, when addressing heathens. That these names were

observed, not only as the day of our Lord's resurrection, but also as the first day of the creation of the world: a plain acknowledgment, that he regarded it as a commemoration of that, which all must allow to be the chief thing commemorated by the ancient Sabbath. It may be further remarked on this passage, that though he mentions Saturday, he mentions it as no peculiar day: and, indeed, in his Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, he argues that, as there had been holy and righteous men before Moses' time, without his Sabbaths, so there might be now; an argument used also by Irenæus and Tertullian, the latter assuming that the alleged fact could not be disproved, though he confesses, it was not allowed by the Jews. And here, though I cannot admit the account of the Patriarchal times given by these Christian Fathers, I must admit the account of their own, implied by their argument, namely, that it was not the practice of Christians in their time to keep, besides the Lord's day, the Jewish Sabbath also: nay, Tertullian distinctly tells us, that the Christian Church in his age had nothing to do with the Jewish Sabbaths.

new at Rome, in Justin's time, may appear from his expressions, "the day called Sunday," and "the day after Saturday, which is Sunday."

In an Epistle to the Romans from Dionysius, who was Bishop of Corinth in the reign of the younger Antonine, he says, "This day being the Lord's day, we kept it holy." Tertullian too informs us, that the Christian Church kept Sunday as a festival; that on that day alone, and not on Saturday also, as was the practice of some very few, they used to pray, not on their knees, but standing, and to lay aside every appearance of an anxious and troubled mind, putting off even business, lest by any means they should give place to the devil; this practice being according to the doctrine they had received: and in another place he exhorts his fellow Christians not to keep the heathen festivals, but the Lord's day and Christian festivals alone, as these would be enough, if they needed bodily relaxation [1].

[1] See Tertullian Apol. adv. Gentes, c. 16. "Diem Solis lætitiæ indulgemus."—De Oratione, c. 17. "De genu quoque ponendo varietatem observationis patitur oratio *per pauculos quosdam* qui Sabbato abstinent genibus. Nos vero, *sicut accepimus*, solo die Dominico resurrectionis, non ab isto tantum, sed omni anxietatis habitu et officia (officio) cavere debemus, differentes etiam negotia, ne quem diabolo locum demus." He adds, indeed, "Tantundem et spatio Pentecostes, quæ eâdem exultationis solemnitate dispungitur." This, however, I think, refers only to the standing posture at prayer, the subject of which Tertullian is speak-

These extracts from the early Fathers seem sufficient to refute the notion, that Sunday was not set apart from the business of the world for the service of religion before the edict of Constantine. It cannot, indeed, be supposed that the emperor, especially if he had not then been converted to Christianity, would have enjoined his subjects to keep holy the Lord's day, had not such been the general desire and doctrine at least, if not the general practice, as far as was permitted, of the Christian Church in his empire. And in this question the desire and doctrine of the Church are

ing, and to the rule of never fasting during these fifty days. Compare De Corona Militis, c. 3. De Idololatriâ, c. 14. "Nobis, quibus Sabbata extranea sunt, &c." "We who have nothing to do with the Sabbaths, and new moons, and feasts once acceptable to God," yet join in heathen festivals. After some severe remarks on this practice, he thus proceeds: "If you need bodily relaxation, you have, I will not only say, holidays, which are your own as a Christian, but even more, than you gain by compliance with heathens. For heathen festivals are yearly, yours weekly, each eighth day. Si quid et carni indulgendum est, habes non dicam tuos dies tantum, sed et plures. Nam Ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est; tibi octavus quisque dies." His argument against keeping the Sabbath, from what he supposes the usage of the Patriarchs, is in his treatise Adv. Judæos, c. 2 and 4. On the practice of standing up to pray, see note (B) at the end of this Sermon.

of more importance to consider than her practice, when her practice was under constraint. The edict too itself, Constantine having misunderstood the Church's desire, commanded that Friday, the day of our Lord's passion, should be observed with the same honour as Sunday, the day of his resurrection. There must, therefore, have been something independent of this edict, which caused the Lord's day, and it alone, to be observed as a weekly festival in the Christian Church. As to the practice before the reign of Constantine, since the chief end of rest from labour on the Lord's day is the due performance of its religious services, it must be acknowledged, that rest was less necessary to keep up the spirit of religion in the days of the Church's persecution, when none were her members but who sincerely believed, and earnestly desired to meet for public worship; and, perhaps, by being less strict on this point, they may have enjoyed a more undisturbed exercise of their devotions, than they would have done, if they had attempted, each Lord's day, to abstain altogether from their ordinary business, and so have provoked their persecutors: but in happier times, when the government, under which Christians are placed, permits or requires the due celebration of it,

it is not the law of the land alone, but the paramount law of the Almighty God, which bids us remember to keep holy each seventh day.

And this was precisely the advantage derived from the edict of Constantine — it enabled Christians to do that, which, according to the doctrine of the Church, had before been their duty, as far as it was in their power. "As in the old time God gave command to keep holy the Sabbath-day, in memory of the first creation of the world," says Athanasius, who lived in this age, "we accordingly observe the Lord's day, in memory of the second and new creation." And again he says[1], "The Sabbath indeed was held in honour by them of old; but the Lord has transferred the day of the Sabbath to the Lord's day." About forty years afterwards, when the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths, which had become so general at the close of this century, was evidently gaining ground in the eastern Church, a decree was passed, in the council held at Laodicea[2],

[1] Athanas. de Sabbato et Circumcisione, and De Semente. The passages will be found in the Appendix.

[2] Οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς Ἰουδαΐζειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ· τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν προτιμῶντες, εἴγε δύναιντο, σχολάζειν, ὡς Χρισ-

"that members of the Church should not rest from work on the Sabbath, like Jews, but should labour on that day, and preferring in honour the Lord's day, then, if it be in their power, should rest from work, as Christians:" and Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, of the same age in the western Church, declares, that on the eighth day, that is, the first of the week, Christians enjoyed the festival of a perfect Sabbath[1].

It is true the early Fathers continually speak of an eternal Sabbath, a perpetual rest from the works of sin, commencing, in some degree at least, to a sincere Christian, in this life, and declare it to be substituted for the Jewish Sabbath in the Christian scheme: but there is nothing in these expressions inconsistent with their regarding the Lord's day substituted for it also, being, like it, a type[2] of that same eter-

τιανοί. Concil. Laodicense, Can. 29. See Lardner's Cred. Gosp. Hist. Part II. chap. 85.

[1] Cum in septimo die Sabbati sit norma et observantia constituta,—tamen nos in octavâ die, quæ et ipsa prima est, perfecti sabbati festivitate lætamur. Hilar. Prol. in Psalm. See note (C) at the end of this Sermon.

[2] So Barnabas; and also Basil de Spiritu Sancto, c. 27, speaking of the Lord's day, says,—"This day, which is at once both the first day of the week and the eighth, foreshews that really first and true eighth day, which the Psalmist mentions in the titles of some of the Psalms (see

nal Sabbath in heaven. Nor does it present any reasonable ground of objection to the view here taken, that in their writings both these days retain each its appropriate name, by which they are called in the Holy Scriptures. There is, indeed, in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, a passage, which seems to shew a reason, why the Fathers, in the early times, could not with advantage have called the Lord's day by the name of the Christian's Sabbath. "The new law[1]," says he, "would have you keep a continual Sabbath: but you think yourselves religious because you rest from labour a single day, not considering the end for which that rest was appointed." Now, if the Jews in that age laid greater stress on the obligation to rest from work on the seventh day, than on its religious services; if they regarded it as kept holy, so long as it was not made common or profane by their ordinary labour; and if the Christians, on the other hand, though nothing kept them from the public services of religion on the Lord's day, yet were prevented by the

Septuag. Ps. vi. and xi.), the state that is to be after these times,—the ceaseless day, that has neither evening nor morrow,—the life that knows neither end nor decay."—Routh's Reliq. Sacr. Vol. III. p. 250.

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. c. 12.—Paris, 1742.

heathen powers from making it a day of rest; does not this state of things sufficiently account for the language of the Fathers on this subject? If they could not themselves enjoy a perfect rest on the first day of the week, could they urge the observance of it, *as a new and Christian Sabbath,* upon those who regarded strict rest as the chief end of the Sabbath-day, and which alone that word expresses? Certainly, after the edict of Constantine, we find the name of Sabbath [1] applied, by Hilary of Poitiers, to the festivity of the Lord's day; and perhaps this sense may be given also to the above-cited words of Athanasius.

Absolute rest from labour, however, as appears from the fourth commandment, is not the chief end and design of the institution of a Sabbath, but that the day may be kept holy: rest is principally important, not as an end, but as a means to promote this, the first and chief design: and the absolute rest that commandment enjoins, seems to have been intended to continue for a time only, as far as it had reference to the then peculiar state of the Jews, by their bondsmen's rest reminding them

[1] See in the Appendix a remarkable passage from Clem. Alex. Strom. VI.

of their own rest from bondage in Egypt, by the common national enjoyment of that rest making their Sabbaths a sign; a sign given by God to them, not as distinguished from the Patriarchs, who were dead, (as some[1] seem to suppose) but as distinguished from the heathen, who were living around them.

Perhaps, however, it will be said, it does not appear, that either the Apostles or the early Christian Fathers ever enforced the duty of observing the Lord's day by reference to the fourth commandment: yet to me this seems only what we might have expected, even if the occasions of mentioning the duty had been more frequent, and the members of the primitive Church less ready and zealous to perform it. For at that time, for fifteen hundred years and more, the last day of the week had been kept in obedience to this commandment by the nation, to which many of those who heard them belonged. The reference, then, to give it force, must always have been accompanied with a double explanation, that they were no longer bound to keep the last day of the week, and that the first was substituted in its room: whereas, the very ground of this substitution

[1] Paley's Mor. Phil. B. V. c. 7.

furnished at once an ample motive for setting apart the Lord's day for public prayer and praise; a motive which even its name suggests—grateful love of him, who, on the day he thus hallowed as his own, rose again for our justification. But this affords no reason, why stress should not be laid on the obligation of the fourth commandment in the present times, when now, for a far longer period, the duty it enjoins, of keeping holy each seventh day, has been fulfilled in the Christian Church, by keeping the Lord's day especially consecrated to the public worship of the Almighty.

In his Epistle to the Colossians, St. Paul presses the duty of filial obedience on the very ground, on which we may conceive the observance of the Lord's day to have been pressed in the primitive Church. "Children," says he, "obey your parents: for this is well-pleasing to the Lord." And certainly we should be told, that Christians are to be exhorted to filial obedience on this ground alone, and not by reference to the Decalogue, if the same Apostle had not, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, rested this same duty on the obligation of the fifth commandment.

The peculiar doctrines of Christianity furnish us, no doubt, with the best and most inspiriting

motives to guide us in all our conduct; yet the words, which God himself spake on Sinai, are often found to be useful and powerful remembrancers of the several duties they command. That the fourth commandment was there given is certain, and it is incumbent on those, who would tell us, it is abolished and wholly repealed, to shew us where. All that can be certainly inferred on this subject from the Scriptures is, that we are not bound to keep holy[1] the last day of the week, as the Jews were, and that we are not bound to keep a Sabbath in that strictness which, under the severest penalties, was imposed on them. To regulate our practice by these certain inferences is our safest and wisest course, and not, without express authority from him who gave it, rashly to declare his commandment repealed, lest haply we be found to fight even against God.

It remains only to consider, how far that strictness of rest, to which the Jews were bound on their Sabbaths, has been loosed for us on ours; and, in considering this question, we have Christ himself for our guide. Christ has taught us that works of necessity, which

[1] Col. ii. 16.

cannot be deferred, even though they should be laborious works, are no breach of the Sabbath. It was no breach of the Sabbath to loose cattle from the stall, and lead them away to water: nay, more, if a sheep[1], or an ass, or an ox, should have fallen into a pit, the labour of laying hold on it, and pulling it out, was no breach of the Sabbath: much less is the holy rest violated by attending our fellow-creatures in their distress, and by ministering to the wants of the sick and infirm. But these works, it may be thought, are excepted on another ground, as deeds of mercy; and deeds of mercy, as our poet Dryden[2] says,

"Deeds of mercy are a part of rest:"

to do them, is to lay aside the works of the world, and engage oneself in the works of God: they are our acceptable offering to Him, who will have mercy rather than sacrifice. Other works, however, which are not works of mercy, nor yet can be said to be of absolute necessity, but which are required by decency and our reasonable convenience, may be done without violation of the sacredness of the day. When he, who had been healed at the Pool, Beth-

[1] Luke xiii. 15, and xiv. 5.

[2] Dryden's Eleonora.

esda[1], took up his bed on the Sabbath, and carried it away, this was no breach of the sacred rest, though the Jews so regarded it—for he did that only which Christ had told him he might do; and it cannot be pretended that the ancient Sabbath was at this time set aside. Even in the Mosaic law, to prepare what we must eat, was permitted on the days of holy convocation in the Passover week, on which it was commanded that no manner of work was to be done: and though the Pharisees did not allow that this permission extended also to the Sabbath day, but censured the disciples, because on that day[2], as they passed a corn-field, they plucked the ears of corn, (an act on other days, at least, expressly[3] allowed in the law), and because they rubbed them in their hands, that they might eat them, our Lord's reproof of the misplaced censure teaches us, that such acts are not forbidden by the spirit of the fourth commandment. Works of mercy then, works of necessity, which cannot be deferred, and all those ordinary services which the daily convenience of domestic life requires, are no breach of this day's hallowed rest, provided, in this last case at least, they do not prevent any one

[1] John v. [2] Luke vi. [3] Deut. xxiii. 25.

from bearing a part in its sacred duties. And by its sacred duties I would understand, not public worship alone, though this is the chief; but it is a practice, to which the devotion of public worship inclines us, and which is obviously proper in itself, to keep holy this day, by devoting some portion of it, *more especially*, to private meditation and the study of God's holy word. What portion of the day each individual ought so to employ, it is not my part to determine. The Gospel does not give us precise rules, but rather principles, which we are to apply honestly and conscientiously to all occasions, as they arise. It is not good, that the mind should be forced to the study of religion, nor ought Sunday to be made a day of intense application even on religious subjects. As it is a festival, the innocent enjoyment of society well befits the day; but as it is a holy festival, surely the enjoyment of religious exercises ought to be amongst its enjoyments; and we may justly regard the relish and delight we have in these, as a mark and a gage, by which we may measure the progress we make in preparing ourselves for that eternal Sabbath, which remains for the people of God. It seems, indeed, absurd to suppose we can have any real desire for heaven, if we have no delight now on

earth in those sacred employments, which we must needs believe will form our business and our pleasure there.—May He, whose goodness every Sunday, more especially, we commemorate as our Creator, our Redeemer, and our Sanctifier—may He make each Lord's day, each Christian Sabbath, to us, the means of preparing us, more and more, for the eternal Sabbath in his own blessed presence, and fixing our affections there, may He incline our hearts to keep His law, by remembering to keep holy each seventh day.

Note A.

on the epistle of st. barnabas.

Modern divines have been much divided in their opinions on the genuineness of this catholic Epistle of Barnabas. That Barnabas is the author, is maintained or allowed by Isaac Vossius, in a note on his edition of it, by Dr. Bernard, who furnished what were saved of Archbishop Usher's notes from the Oxford fire, by Bishop Fell, who used these notes in his edition, by Dodwell, Du Pin, Dr. Cave, Dr. Mill, Archbishop Wake, Dr. S. Clarke, Eachard, Whiston, Dr. Jenkin, Bishop Pearson, and Dr. Lardner; denied or doubted by Menardus, Archbishop Laud on receiving Menardus' edition, Cotelerius, Fr. Spanheim, Toland, Basnage, and Jeremiah Jones. The chief ground of

their objection to its genuineness, the fanciful interpretations of Scripture it contains, is ably met by Vossius, who observed, that the same objection may be raised against the Epistle of another "fellow-labourer of St. Paul," Clement of Rome, which yet is universally acknowledged; that it is unreasonable, then, on such ground, to deny that to be the work of Barnabas, which is expressly ascribed to him by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other ancient Fathers: for though Eusebius calls it apocryphal and spurious, he does not thereby mean to express a doubt who is the author, (for he calls it Barnabas' Epistle) but to express his conviction, that it is not a part of the sacred canon. The declaration, that Christ and his cross were revealed to Abraham by the Greek letters expressing 318, the number of persons, whom, it is alleged, he circumcised, is undoubtedly sufficient to exclude the Epistle from the sacred canon: but there is no more reason to suppose the date of the origin of the Greek alphabet would have been known to Barnabas, than to Clement of Alexandria or Ambrose, who both adopted from him this very notion. Mr. Jones has an ingenious argument to shew that Barnabas could not have been the author, who must (as he contends) have been, not a Jew, but a Gentile, continually in the Epistle distinguishing himself from the Jews, and making himself one with those he addresses, whom Jones considers as Gentiles: Archbishop Wake, on the other hand, thinks the Epistle addressed to Jews who believed; Lardner, with more reason, says it is addressed to all Christians. It is a Catholic Epistle: and whoever consults it, may see that the distinction is made, not as Jones supposed, between Jew and Gentile, but between Jew and Christian, a more natural distinction after the destruction of Jerusalem. Barnabas says, "I write not as a teacher, but as one of you;"

" I beseech you, as one of your own brethren, loving you all beyond my own life :" and, indeed, in the following passage[1], where he makes himself one with them as Christians, he seems to distinguish himself from them as Gentiles. After declaring that the Jews were not worthy of the covenant which had been given them by Moses, a servant, he thus proceeds : " The Lord was made manifest, that *they* should fill up the measure of their sins, and that *we* should receive the covenant of the Lord Jesus by him who is the heir. And again, the prophet says, ' I have given thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be for salvation to the ends of the earth, saith the Lord,' the God who hath *redeemed thee :* who for that very end was prepared, that by his own appearing he might *redeem* from darkness *our* hearts, already devoured by death and delivered over to the lawlessness of error, and might establish a covenant with *us* by the word." These considerations, (to which may be added the way in which he more than once speaks of the Jewish covenant as having been " promised to *the fathers,*" and other expressions, affording a presumption, that the author was by birth a Jew,) seem quite to set aside Mr. Jones's argument. Mr. Jones, indeed, himself allows, that if the Epistle had spoken of the Jewish covenant as promised to " *our fathers,*" as Archbishop Wake has translated it, the words would be " a proof that the author was a Jew." This, however, is not exactly so : Clement of Rome, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, applies the words " our fathers" both to Jacob and to Abraham : yet, though he is said to have been a Gentile by birth, Dr. Cave tells us he was Bishop of the Jewish

[1] Sect. x. Voss. Edit.; or xiv. Archbishop Wake's translation.

converts at Rome during the time of Linus and Cletus. Whether the expression be "our fathers" or "the fathers," (both are so used by St. Paul), is of no great importance: the sense must be the same: neither proves that the writer was a Jew; either affords a presumption that he was, by proving that he had a common feeling with that people. The Epistle was certainly written after the destruction of Jerusalem; very soon after it, argues Lardner, with much force, chiefly from this passage: "Although *you have seen* so great signs and wonders done among the people of the Jews, yet, this notwithstanding, the Lord *forsakes* them." Both Dodwell and Mill consider it to have been written before the Epistle of St. Jude, or the Epistles and Revelation of St. John. It may then be accepted as the Epistle of St. Barnabas, according to the evidence of the ancient Fathers of the Church.

See Vossius' edit. of Barnab. and Ignat. Epistles. London, 1680, p. 308.—Pearson on the Creed. Oxford, 1797, Vol. II. p. 242.—Jones on the Canon of the New Test. Vol. II. ch. 37 to ch. 43.—and Lardner's Works, Vol. I. Pt. 2. ch. 1.

Note B.

on the standing posture in prayer, and the observance of pentecost.

The following passage, from the "Questions and Answers for the Orthodox," (a work absurdly ascribed to Justin, who suffered martyrdom several years before Irenæus), throws some light both on the custom of using the standing posture in prayer, and on the estimation in which the fifty days after Easter were held, in comparison with the Lord's day.—"Quest. If to bend the knee in prayer more com-

mends the supplicant, and more draws on the Divine compassion, than to stand praying, why, on the Lord's day, and from Easter to the day of Pentecost, do not men kneel as they pray? and whence has this custom been introduced in the Churches?—Ans. Since it is our duty always to remember both our fall in sins, and the grace of our Lord Christ, by which we have been raised up from our fallen state; therefore, our bending the knee on the six days is a symbol of our fall in sins, but our not kneeling on the Lord's day, is a symbol of our resurrection, by which, through the grace of Christ, we have been delivered from our sins, and from death, slain in him. And this custom had its origin in the apostolical times, as the blessed martyr, Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, declares, in his Treatise on Easter, where he makes mention of the fifty days of Pentecost also, on which we do not bend the knee, because they are equivalent to the Lord's day, in respect of the reason which has been assigned for this custom."—Quest. and Answ. 115.

The fact, that Ascension-day was distinguished above the rest, when it was ranked with the high festivals, shows plainly, that the fifty days of Pentecost were not all observed with the same solemnity as the Lord's day. The same thing also appears by the following note.

Note C.

Nos in octavâ die, quæ et ipsa prima.]—The use of dies as feminine, though in the immediately-preceding clause it is masculine, is singular; but it seems to have arisen only from the eighth day having been mentioned just above, in conjunction with the word ogdoas.

That it may not be thought Hilary is speaking of the eighth day (as they called the glorified state) in the world

to come, of which the Lord's day here is a type, and to which the word ogdoas is equally applicable, I give the following account of the argument, in which the passage is introduced. Having noticed that the fiftieth Psalm (according to the Septuagint) comes before that on Doeg the Edomite, though, in the order of history, it ought to come after it, he observes a propriety in this, a prayer for remission of sins being placed as the fiftieth, the number of the Jubilee year, the Sabbath of Sabbaths. He then remarks that the Book of Psalms consists of three sets of fifty, and that whoever considers the last Psalm [1] of each set, (according to the Septuagint), will perceive that this arrangement agrees with the economy of our salvation; for the first step of our salvation is the regeneration and becoming a new man, after the remission of sins; then comes the kingdom of the Lord, reserved for the times of the holy city and the heavenly Jerusalem; and, last of all, heavenly glory being consummated in us, we advance through the kingdom of the Son into the kingdom of God the Father, in which all spirits shall praise the Lord. And so the subject is introduced, in a preface on the Psalms; for he immediately proceeds, speaking, however, no longer of the Jubilee year, but of the day of Pentecost; "that these, (i. e. the fiftieths), are the Sabbaths of Sabbaths, appears from the number seven multiplied by itself, which number, the eighth, (ogdoas), being both the first day and the eighth, added after the seventh week, completes, according to the fulness of the Gospel. And, indeed, these Sabbaths of Sabbaths were so religiously observed by the Apostles, that, on these fifty days, no one, either in his prayers prostrated himself to the ground, or by fasting broke the fes-

[1] Psalms li., ci., and cl., in our translation.

tivity of this spiritual blessedness: which very same practice is appointed even independently of this festival for the Lord's days, which are added beyond the number of the Sabbath-day, (seven), by the fulness of the Gospel. For though the name and the observance of the Sabbath were appointed for the seventh day, yet we, every eighth day, which same also is the first day, enjoy the festival of a perfect Sabbath."—Prolog. in Psalm. § 10, 11, 12.

We may observe here, that though the prohibition to kneel or to fast was common to all the days of Pentecost as well as to the Lord's day, yet it was on this day alone they enjoyed a perfect Sabbath.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

THE history of the Sabbath, by Dr. Heylyn, having been strongly commended as throwing much light on the subject, I felt it necessary to consult that work, before I ventured to publish my own view. It is a work, which undeniably makes a show of great learning, but I cannot think it entitled to praise as a candid enquiry into the truth. Provoked by the extravagance of the Puritans in his day, Dr. Heylyn seems to have run into the opposite extreme, and to be continually labouring to warp the authorities, he brings forward, into an agreement with the position he has undertaken to defend. His biographer, Vernon[1], informs us, the history was written, printed, and presented to the king (by whose special command he undertook it) in a less space of time than four months: and certainly it bears marks of the haste in which it was written.

It consists of two parts, and professes to give a complete history of the Sabbath; in the first part, from the creation of the world to the destruction of the Temple; in the second, from the first preaching of the Gospel to Dr. Heylyn's own times.

[1] Life of Heylyn by G. Vernon. London, 1682.

In the first part he denies, that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, or that it was observed before the days of Moses. As my argument, however, on this branch of the subject rests not merely on the probabilities which may be drawn from the expressions in Genesis and Exodus, but chiefly on the authority of St. Paul, I should leave Heylyn's remarks on it unnoticed, were I not aware, that if any strong probability were established against the primeval institution, the interpretation I have given of Heb. iv. would be called in question. It has, indeed, been objected, that St. Paul does not distinctly assert, that the Sabbath was appointed from the foundation of the world: but surely it is enough, if the fact be clearly implied in his argument; and it is not intelligible for what purpose the creation is there mentioned at all, except from that time the people of God had enjoyed this his holy rest. Now the strength of Heylyn's argument lies in this, that the early Christian Fathers, Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, all argue against the necessity of a Sabbath under the Christian covenant, from the non-existence of a Sabbath before the days of Moses: and if their argument had been universally admitted by the Jews, to whom it is addressed, there would confessedly be much weight in what is urged by Heylyn; but, not to speak of St. Paul and the Jews of Palestine, to whom he was writing, Tertullian expressly says[1], that the Jews in his day did not admit, that the Sabbath was first instituted in Moses' time, but contended for its primeval institu-

[1] Adv. Jud. c. iv.

tion. And it appears from Selden [1], that they were much divided in their opinions on the subject; some interpreting Gen. ii. 3, as an anticipation of the Mosaic institution, (benedixit in Mannah et sanctificavit in Mannah), yet thinking Abraham kept a Sabbath through a foreknowledge of the law; others understanding it as a sanctification of that very seventh day only; others as an institution of a Sabbath to be thenceforth observed. No argument, then, on one side or the other, can be drawn from the Rabbinical writings, among which we may class [2] the reputed "seven precepts of Noah;" nor can any weight be attached to the opinions of the early Christian Fathers, who could only derive their information on this head from the Jews. When Heylyn argues, that Adam received no command to keep a Sabbath, because some early Christians have thought the command of the forbidden fruit the only one given in Eden, he does but beg the question as to the meaning of Gen. ii. 3: that the command, the violation of which was the fall of man, should stand prominent in the Sacred History, is natural; and it would be somewhat extravagant thence to infer, that our first parents in Eden had no other duty than to obey this command only.

But his attempt to get rid of the natural inference from Noah keeping weeks in the ark, deserves to be given in his own words. He quotes from Tostat, Bishop of Avila, who died about the middle of the

[1] De Jure Naturali, c. xi. xiii. xiv.

[2] Jenning's Jewish Antiquities, B. I. c. 3.

fifteenth century. "Noah desired to know whether the waters were decreased. Now, since the waters are regulated by the moon, Noah was most especially to regard her motions: for, as she is either in opposition or conjunction with the sun, in her increase or in her wane, there is proportionably an increase or falling of the waters; Noah then, considering the moon in her several quarters, which commonly, we know, are at seven days' distance, sent forth his birds to bring him tidings: for the text tells us that, he sent out the raven and the dove four times. And the fourth time, the moon being then in the last quarter, when both by the ordinary course of nature, the waters usually are, and by the will of God were then much decreased, the dove, which was sent out had found good footing on the Earth, and returned no more." On this Heylyn exclaims, "So far the learned Abulensis; which makes clear the case." Very clear, indeed! but it is difficult to say, how these learned persons ascertained the phases of the moon at each of these four several periods, and scarce less difficult, sufficiently to admire their ingenious theory of the tides, their fancy, that the whole bulk of the mighty waters is really less in the neap, than in the spring: did neither of them ever hear, that the higher the tide flows, the further it ebbs? Noah waited seven days for the ordinary influence of the moon in her last quarter decreasing the waters! Such an argument cannot be allowed, though commended by all the literary fame of Peter Heylyn, and "the learned Abulensis."

On considering the dispersion from Babel, Heylyn displays a better knowledge[1] of Natural Philosophy, but not more force in his conclusion. To be sure, when the descendants of Noah became dispersed over all the earth, the Sabbath, supposing it to have been kept by all, must have been kept by different settlers at different hours, varying with the difference of the longitude of the places where they severally dwelt: but this does not warrant him in arguing, that to keep a Sabbath cannot be a moral duty, on the ground that the moral law, in the case supposed, would have been subject to change. Whatever other grounds there may be for questioning the morality of the duty, there are none here. Whilst these settlers kept each the day which was the seventh to them, the duty, performed by

[1] Why Heylyn was so much better informed on the subject of longitude, than on the tides, may appear from the following anecdote. Soon after he had obtained his stall at Westminster, his attention was directed to this subject by Lord Falkland, who desired him to confer with a naval officer, Captain Nelson, (whether of the same family, as well as profession, with his late illustrious namesake, I know not,) who thought he had discovered a method of finding the longitude at sea, and whom the Mathematicians, who pronounced his method erroneous, had failed to convince. Heylyn would have declined the office, as being unacquainted with the question; but being pressed by Lord Falkland in the name of the King, he consulted with Oughtred, who some years afterwards made the Captain understand, what must necessarily remain unknown terms in his problem. To this incident we are probably indebted for Heylyn's speculations on longitude here: and, whatever may be thought of them, certainly it is to his credit, to have been selected for such an office by Lucius Cary.

them all, would have been the same: there would have been no change either in it, or in the law commanding it. He puts a case, however, of a party sailing westward round the world, and on reaching their home again, finding, that the day, which was Saturday by their calculation, was Sunday to those, who remained at home; and then he pretends to doubt, which day these voyager's would be bound to keep, though in telling the story, he himself tells us, they had lost a day. Quite of a piece with this trifling, is his declaration afterwards, that from the time that the day was supernaturally lengthened at the prayer of Joshua, no Sabbath was kept by the Jews on the precise day the law had appointed. And here he amuses himself with speculating on the impossibility of keeping each seventh day as a Sabbath within the Polar Circles! This, certainly, is not much to the purpose: and indeed, as it appears to me, his only argument for the non-existence of a Sabbath before Moses' time, which might reasonably cause a doubt, is the condition of the Israelites before their deliverance from Egypt. It seems probable, that they could not[1] have kept a Sabbath during their bondage in that country: still as their very residence there must as certainly have prevented them from offering any sacrifices (Exod viii. 26), we can no more infer, that the worshippers of the Lord did not keep a Sabbath before *their bondage*, than that they did not offer sacrifices before *their residence* in

[1] See extract from Maimon.: Bishop Patrick's Comment. Exod. xx. 11.

Egypt. But sacrifice was unquestionably a part of worship in the patriarchal times. And to say that, if a command to keep the Sabbath had been given at the creation, the Israelites would have persisted in keeping it, notwithstanding Pharaoh's tyranny, just as, at a far later period of their history, they did, notwithstanding the cruelty of Antiochus Epiphanes, is wholly to lose sight of the circumstances which mark these different periods. Even in the days of devoted heroism, to which Heylyn thus refers us, many of the Israelites obeyed[1] the tyrant, consented to his religion, and profaned the Sabbath: yet they had been taught to regard its profanation with peculiar abhorrence: the Sabbath had been declared to be a sign between the Lord and their nation; and its observance had been enforced by the law under the penalty of death. That penalty, however, is evidently a part of their civil law, and has no necessary connexion with the great weekly duty, known of old, and re-asserted in the fourth commandment; nor is there any reason to suppose, that the absolute rest that commandment enjoins, was required by the primeval institution, when God blessed the seventh day, and made it holy.

Having gone through the part of Dr. Heylyn's book, in which he attempts to shew that no Sabbath was known before the law, I do not feel myself called upon to examine the statements and the reasoning by which he would establish the paradox, that even under the law, the Sabbath was not generally kept according

[1] Maccab. i. 43.

to God's appointment: but I briefly observe, that when, to shew that it was not so kept in the wilderness, he asserts that the people of Israel had [1] no sacrifices there, his assertion is not supported by the prophet Amos [2], to whom he refers, and is in direct opposition to the [3] account given in the Pentateuch.

It is the second part of his book, which is most important to be considered, because here the question is not, what has been the practice of others, but, what ought to be the practice of ourselves. And no one can be surprised, that he who positively denies that a Sabbath was kept in the patriarchal ages, and is unwilling to allow that it was kept, as God commanded, during the time of the Jewish covenant, should endeavour to maintain, that no weekly Sabbath is to be kept by Christians. But the way in which he attempts to lessen the force of the Scriptural proofs of honour paid to the Lord's day, is a lamentable instance of the length to which a man may be carried, when he is bent on vindicating an opinion, rather than on seeking the truth. To begin with the day of the Resurrection, he says, "we find not on the news, that the Apostles came together for the performance of divine and religious exercises,—or that our Saviour came amongst them until *late at night*:" and hence he concludes Christ sanctioned no such religious exercises on the day, as a Sabbath requires: nay, to lose nothing that may be twisted into a support of his opinion, he says,

[1] Numb. xxvii. 9. [2] Amos v. 25.
[3] Exod. xxiv. 4; Levit. ix; and Numb. vii.

the two disciples, who walked to Emmaus, seven miles and a half, and back again, would have been rebuked by Christ for their violation of the new Christian Sabbath, had any such been intended; as if it could not have been intended, the day should be kept instead of the Jewish Sabbath, unless the same strictness of rest, the same limit of a Sabbath-day's journey had been imposed; as if too, the very first sanction of a religious assembly on this day, was not Christ's appearing in the midst of them, after these disciples had returned to Jerusalem. To be sure, Heylyn tells us, that was not till late at night: but St. John says, it was "the same day at evening, being the first day of the week." I suspect Heylyn was led into this blunder by the expression of these disciples to Christ at Emmaus, "it is toward evening, and the day is far spent;" κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα, *sol inclinavit;* the sun has begun

"Toward Heaven's descent to slope his westering wheel:"

suppose they had said, it is toward three[1] o'clock; that, we know, was the hour of *evening* sacrifice. Again he says, "it is no where to be found, that Christ appeared oftener on the first day, than any other of the week; it being said in holy Scriptures that he was seen of them forty-days, as much on one as on another. His first appearing after the night following his resurrection, which is particularly specified in the book of God, was after eight days, when he shewed himself to Thomas;" but this appearing *after eight days* "should be rather understood of the ninth or tenth, than the

[1] The hour probably was four o'clock.

eighth day after, and therefore could not be upon the first day of the week, as is imagined." This from the learned Dr. Heylyn! Could he have been ignorant, that in the language of the Bible, the expressions "after eight days," and "on the eighth day," signify the same thing? Could he have been ignorant that Christ, speaking of his own resurrection, used both [1] expressions, that after three days he should rise again, and that he should rise again on the third day? And though it was forty days from the day he was first seen of his disciples to his ascension, Heylyn ought to have known, that it was not till they went into Galilee, that he was daily with them, one day as much as another: and when St. John gives the account of his appearing to them at the sea of Galilee, he expressly adds, "[2] this is now the third time Jesus shewed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead." Dr. Heylyn does not seem to have profited much on this subject by reading St. John.

His next attempt, as might be expected, is to prove that no preference for the first day of the week was manifested by the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost: and his mode of doing this is strange. Perhaps we are apt commonly to regard the day of Pentecost as the first day of the week, from bearing in our memories the words in Leviticus [3], that it was from the morrow after the *Sabbath* the seven weeks were to be counted, and that the morrow after

[1] Mark viii. 31; and x. 34. [2] John xxi. 14.
[3] Lev. xxiii.

the seventh *Sabbath* made up the fifty days. It should rather be said, the morrow after the seventh *week* made up the fifty days: for Heylyn justly observes, that the Sabbath, from the morrow of which these seven weeks began, was not the weekly Sabbath, but the first day of unleavened bread, the day of the holy convocation, on which no servile work was to be done. This, indeed, cannot easily be shewn from our English Bible; but the Septuagint says the seven weeks were to be counted from "the morrow of the first day;" and Josephus [1], more distinctly, says, this morrow was "the second day of unleavened bread, the sixteenth of the month." Their authority, then, being accepted, the day of Pentecost, on which the Holy Spirit fell on the assembled disciples, was the first day of the week, because in that year the weekly Sabbath coincided with the day of holy convocation. And this coincidence Heylyn is pleased to call *casual*—he might, without blame, have called it disputable, as it depends on a point which has been much disputed. viz. on what day our Lord was crucified.

I am persuaded, indeed, the day of the crucifixion was that of the Passover, the fourteenth of the month Abib, or Nisan: and the objections commonly urged against this view from the narrative of the three first Evangelists, will appear of less weight, if the following points be borne in mind. The Paschal lamb was to be kept till the fourteenth day of the month, and then be killed in the evening; but it was not to be eaten till night, till that night so much to be observed, on

[1] Antiq. Jud. L. III. c. 10. s. 5, 6.

which the first-born of Egypt were slain, and the Israelites delivered from bondage; that night, however, if they invariably reckoned the night first, properly belonged to the fifteenth day: yet they were also to eat unleavened bread on the fourteenth at even. Now, we learn from these Evangelists, that it was the *day of unleavened bread on which the Passover must be killed*, when Jesus bade his disciples prepare the Passover: but this day, the fourteenth of the month by the description, was truly come on the evening on which it began. To be sure, we read, in St. Matthew and St. Mark, that, after the disciples had made preparations, as they were desired, Jesus sat down with the twelve, when *the evening* was come: but the expression so rendered signifies rather when *it was late*[1]: and late it ought to have been, according to *the hour* at which the passover was to be eaten; and late it was; for when, after the supper was ended, the traitor Judas went out[2], it was night. St. Luke's expression is, "When the hour was come, Jesus sat down with the twelve, and ate that passover which he so earnestly desired to eat with them, before he suffered." There is nothing, then, in the three first Evangelists to shew but that Christ so far anticipated the time of eating the Jewish Passover; and that He, the true Passover, was sacrificed on the appointed day; and before the unbelieving Jews received their once-holy feast, all its holiness was gone. The fifteenth day, we know, was a Sabbath day; and that Christ should have been crucified by the Jews on a Sabbath

[1] Comp. Matt. xxviii. 1. [2] John xiii. 30.

day, is inconsistent with their earnestness, that the bodies should be removed from the cross when the Sabbath drew on: besides, St. John tells us, "they went not into the judgment-hall lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover." The day of the crucifixion, then, was the day[1] of the *cœna pura*, the Paschal supper, to eat which at night, they carefully, throughout the day, kept themselves undefiled; and it should be observed, that the defilement which, according to their notion, would be contracted by removing the bodies from the cross, by a special enactment[2], would not unfit them for the feast. The day of the crucifixion was the Paraseeue, or day of preparation for the Sabbath; and that Sabbath was a high day by the coincidence of the weekly festival with that of the Passover. But this coincidence being granted, (and to me it seems clear from the account), it follows, that the day of Pentecost would be on the same day of the week with our Lord's resurrection. And this is the coincidence Heylyn would represent as casual, as having arisen, forsooth, solely from chance. It is often said, it is absurd to reckon chance among the causes of things: the events we ascribe to chance, are those only of which we cannot discern either the final cause for which, or the proximate cause by which they are brought on; yet these are not less the designed effects of an all-ruling Power, than those in which we clearly trace the agency of his hand. But

[1] Parasceue, quæ dicitur cœna pura, id est, sexta feria, quam et Dominus ostendit passus in eâ. Irenæus, Adv. Hær. V. 23.

[2] Numb. ix. 10.

it is strange indeed that any one, who had at all considered the important consequences of the fact, that the Sabbath immediately followed the day of our Lord's crucifixion, should see nothing of design in the year in which this coincidence would take place, being chosen as the year of his death, and should regard it all as an affair of chance.

His criticisms on Acts xx. 7, are more deserving consideration. He tells us first, that the breaking of bread there mentioned is not the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but only a common meal; that it is so represented by Chrysostom, who says, they made bold with St. Paul's table as if it were their own; and so understood by our Church, who refers us to Acts ii. 46: secondly, that Erasmus, Calvin, and others, have understood the day to be, not the first of the week, but one of the Sabbaths: thirdly, that Austin makes it a question, whether it was (as we should say) the evening before the Lord's day, or the evening of that day on which they met for the Sacrament; on either resolution of this question, says Heylyn, the passage gives no proof that the Lord's day was sanctified by St. Paul at Troas.

Now the authority of Chrysostom's opinion, that the disciples met not for a sacrament, but for an ordinary meal, is completely neutralized by that of his contemporary Austin: and as they lived at the close of the fourth century, they could neither of them have other knowledge on the subject, than the passage itself affords us: and though Heylyn says Acts ii. 46. must be meant of ordinary and common meats; yet, by any

one who reads attentively the four preceding verses, it will rather be understood of sacramental bread; and it may be thus paraphrased: "The disciples every day continuing stedfast in being of one mind as Christians, when they attended the Jewish public place of worship, and in celebrating their own peculiar rite, the Christian sacrament, at their own homes, were provided with food from the common stock, which they received with gladness and singleness of heart." In the Genevan Bible, certainly, the marginal note on Acts xx. 7, referring to this very verse, distinctly adds, "To celebrate the Lord's Supper." Again: whatever may be the judgment of Erasmus, Calvin, and others, the very same words St. Luke has used here, he has used also in his Gospel to signify the first day of the week, the day on which our Lord arose. And whoever carefully reads the passage, I think, will allow that the disciples on this occasion, as the Apostles on the very day of the resurrection, came together on the first day of the week at evening. The practice of keeping the Lord's day, like the Jewish Sabbath, from even to even, which prevailed in Austin's time, appears to have suggested his question, in which he leaned perhaps to a persuasion, that it was Saturday night on which they met, from the resemblance[1] this meeting bears to the vigils before Sunday, the watchings all night through to day-break then observed in the Church. But when the practice of keeping the Lord's day from even to even obtained, is uncertain: the "Questions

[1] Bingham's Ant. B. XIII. c. 9.

to Antiochus," in which it is asserted [1], and which are ascribed to Athanasius, are not, Cave tells us, the work of that Father: and Tertullian, shewing how the festival of the Lord's day may be kept during flight, in times of persecution, says [2], "If you cannot assemble by day, you have the night for the purpose, brightly shining by the light of Christ." The duty, then, which they had been compelled to omit by day, they might yet perform at night. And it is but probable, that where the Roman names of days were adopted, their division of time would be adopted also. The Lord's day could not with propriety have been called Sunday, if it had begun and ended at a different hour from the day so named. Even in the Apostles' times it does not seem that the night was invariably considered as belonging to the following day: we are led to the contrary inference from the first words of the last chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. But however this may be, all I have to contend for is, that the disciples at Troas met together unsummoned on the Lord's day for the purpose of receiving the Sacrament. Whether they took at the same time the supper of Christian charity, the Agape, as was done in the Corinthian Church [3], is neither easy nor important to determine: that they met to receive the Sacrament, gives the religious character

[1] Quest. 53.

[2] De Fugâ in Persec. ad fin. "Habes noctem, luce Christi luminosâ adversus eam. You have the night, the light of Christ shining against its darkness." If the reasoning on this passage seem at all inconsistent with that in p. 152, let it be remembered, the subject there is a Jewish festival, here a Christian one.

[3] 1 Cor. xi.

to the meeting. The preaching of St. Paul through the night, and, if the bread broken, after the young man was restored to life again, was the Eucharist, for which they had met, the deferring the holy Sacrament to this late hour, when Sunday was past; these circumstances were evidently accidental, and do not at all affect the argument drawn from what is here intimated of the practice of the primitive Christians.

But the passages of Scripture, which shew that the Lord's day was observed from the beginning, to give them their due weight, ought to be considered not separately, but as a connected chain of proofs, mutually sustaining each other, and deriving support from the writings of the immediately succeeding ages. All these proofs in themselves, or, however, most of them, are but accidental records of what, being the public practice of the Church, seemed scarcely to require any record at all: yet taken jointly, they present a strength of evidence, which must satisfy the mind of any one who candidly considers them. Such being the nature of the argument, no respect can be felt for the opinions of any one who, like Dr. Heylyn, has slighted that part of it, which is taken from the Holy Scriptures: we will proceed, however, to examine, whether his opinions are countenanced by the writings of the early Fathers.

And here the rock on which he split, was a persuasion, that Saturday was observed as well as Sunday, in the Primitive Church; and this he seems to have grounded chiefly on two Epistles, as he conceived, of Ignatius, the one an Epistle to the Philippians, the other his Epistle to the Magnesians, in which Ignatius

is made to say, "Let us not keep the Sabbath in the Jewish manner, but spiritually, not in bodily ease, but in the study of the law. And after having so kept the Sabbath, let every one who loves Christ, keep the Lord's day festival, the Resurrection day, the Queen and Supreme of days," &c. Now Heylyn's History of the Sabbath was published in 1635, full seven years and more, before light was thrown on the Epistles of Ignatius and the correct text restored, by the learned labours of Archbishop Usher and Isaac Vossius, by whom we are informed that the above-mentioned Epistle to the Philippians is spurious, and the supposed extract from that to the Magnesians an interpolation, both forgeries being probably the work of the fifth century, or perhaps of some later age. If Heylyn had known that there is nothing in Ignatius to lead us to suppose Saturday was then kept as a holy day, he might have felt that no reliance is to be placed on any declarations to this effect in the Apostolical Constitutions, as they are called [1], another forgery probably of the same age, nor yet in the Apostolical Canons.

These celebrated Canons, eighty-five in number, are considered by Bishop Beveridge to be a Collection of the Canons of the Ante-Nicene Councils, and to have been called Apostolical, as written by men of the apostolical age, or as containing apostolical doctrine. That they could not all, at least, have been written either by the Apostles, or by Clement of Rome, to whom they have been ascribed, is demonstrable. The twenty-first and three following Canons bear directly on the peculiar case of Origen; and certainly neither would

[1] Lardner's Cred. Gosp. Hist. Part II. ch. 85.

he have committed his phrenzied act, nor would the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, in direct violation of the twenty-second, have afterwards ordained him a Priest, if such Canons had been then acknowledged in the Church as of apostolical authority. We find too, that when, at a later period of his life, he wrote his Commentary on St. Matthew, in his sober-minded remarks on chap. xix. 12, he makes no reference to any such Canons. These, then, were probably passed at one of those Councils which were convened against him, two of which are mentioned by Dufresnoy; one at Alexandria, A.D. 223, at which Origen, being then a Catechist, was deposed; another, fourteen years afterwards, at Rome. Besides, the substance of some of the apostolical Canons, as that against usury, or that against vice in a clergyman, may be found in those of the Councils[1] held at Eliberis, and at Arles, in the years A.D. 313 and 314: and sometimes the apostolical Canon appears even to be of later date; as where it excommunicates those who, divorcing their wives, marry another, the corresponding one of the Council of Arles *advises* merely, that in such a case they do not marry again in the life-time of their adulterous wives—where the apostolical Canon requires the presence of three bishops at a bishop's consecration, that of Arles requires seven bishops to be present for this purpose, allowing, however, three to be sufficient, if seven cannot be obtained.

That fifty of these Canons were first collected together, and other thirty-five afterwards added, is

[1] See Routh's Reliq. Sacræ, Vol. IV.

shewn by Archbishop Usher, in a Dissertation prefixed to his edition of the Epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius, where he tells us, that the first fifty alone appear in the Latin translation made by Dionysius the Little, about the beginning of the sixth century; and these the Archbishop therefore regards as the most ancient. But Bishop Beveridge informs us, that at this very period the whole eighty-five were known and set forth, as the work of the Apostles and Clement, by John of Antioch, who arranged them with those of several ancient Councils of the eastern Church, under fifty heads, the Canons relating to the same subject being classed together, and the apostolical ones uniformly placed first. Though, then, there is no evidence that the collection of the eighty-five apostolical Canons was known before the middle of the fifth century, Archbishop Usher's reason for regarding the first fifty as the most ancient, is thus completely disproved: and there is reason to believe that, whereas the forty-seventh of these Canons, which denies the validity of baptism by heretics, was made at the Council held under Agrippinus at Carthage[1], A.D. 215; the sixty-eighth, which denies the validity of ordination also, as well as of baptism, by heretics, is that resolved upon at the Council of Iconium, A.D. 235, which is mentioned in an Epistle by Firmilian[2], an eastern Bishop, and is referred to by Novatus, the fourth speaker[3] in the seventh Council under Cyprian at

[1] Cyprian Epist. LXXIII. Cypr. ad Jubaian.

[2] Ibid. LXXV. Firm. ad Cypr.

[3] Routh's Rel. Sacræ, Vol. III. 293.

Carthage. The sixty-eighth Canon, then, is not of a much later date, if it be not even earlier, than those passed on the case of Origen; and yet it will not be thought strange, that this was not included in the number of the first fifty, if it be considered how strong a probability there is, that the Canons of Western Councils should have been first collected, as the whole collection was received under the name of Clement of Rome.

But supposing generally that all the eighty-five Canons were collected from the Ante-Nicene Councils, it is evident that some of them at least have been corrupted by interpolations. For instance, the last Canon gives a catalogue of the books of Holy Scripture; and after reciting those of the New Testament as far as the Epistle of St. Jude, excepting only the Acts of the Apostles, it thus concludes: "Two Epistles of Clement, and the Constitutions addressed to you Bishops, by me, Clement, in eight books, which are not to be divulged before all, on account of the mystical things they contain; and the Acts of us the Apostles." That some fraud has here been practised, is manifest at the first glance. The interpolator, in his eagerness to pass off the Constitutions as the work of Clement of Rome, overlooked the absurdity of making him speak of himself in the first person as the author of them, immediately after calling his own Epistles, the Epistles of Clement: and the attempt to gain a sanction for what precedes, by placing the Acts of the Apostles last, and to make all appear the production of the Apostles and of Clement, by inserting the word "us," is truly con-

temptible. Since, then, fraud has been so evidently employed in these Canons, none of them, if its matter be questionable, can be entitled to be received, merely because it is found amongst the rest, but each must be tried on its own grounds.

Now the Canon which alone concerns the subject of our enquiry, is the sixty-sixth: it declares, that "if any clergyman be detected fasting on the Lord's day or on the Sabbath, save one only, he shall be deposed; if any layman, he shall be excommunicated;" and it may be seen, either that this is altogether spurious, or at least, that the words, "or on the Sabbath, save one only," are an interpolation. For, though we should not be justified in rejecting it at once as not included in the original fifty, Archbishop Usher has shewn, that about the period when this Canon is first *known* to have existed in its present form, there appeared the forged writings under the name of Ignatius; the interpolated copy of his Epistle to the Magnesians, from which an extract has already been given, and the Epistle to the Philippians falsely ascribed to him, which declares, almost in the words of the Canon, that "if any man fast on the Lord's day or on the Sabbath, save the one Sabbath of the Passover, he is guilty of the death of Christ;" and there appeared also the falsely-called Apostolical Constitutions, enjoining men, again and again, not to fast, but to keep festival on the Lord's day and on the Sabbath, save one only. On comparing together these documents, all appearing about the same time in the Eastern Church, who can doubt but that they are the coinage of the same age

and party, a shameless attempt to palm upon the world the practice of the day as that of the apostolical age, and to maintain the Saturday festival of the east against the Saturday fast of the west. It is absurd to suppose the practice of keeping fast on Saturdays would have been introduced in the Western Church, and at Rome too, if the Canon we are considering had then been acknowledged as authorized by the Apostles or by Clement of Rome.

Bishop Beveridge[1], indeed, attempts to defend this very Canon, and, as to the Lord's day, observes, with much force, that where Tertullian[2] tells us it was regarded as impiety to fast on that day, he distinctly classes this sentiment among the things which were received by tradition from the Apostles themselves; but when he attempts to shew, from the same writer, that the Church never fasted on a Saturday, except in the week of the Passover, he has mistaken the meaning of the passage[3] to which he refers. Tertullian there tells us, that the Church did sometimes fast on a Saturday; and, being himself then a Montanist, upbraids them for it, alleging that they never ought to fast on that day, except at the Passover; and it cannot be contended, that the rule thus laid down is a reference to the Canon in question; for he immediately adds the reason of the rule. This passage of Tertullian, however, shall be more fully considered in pursuing an enquiry closely connected with our present

[1] Dissert. on Apost. Can. B. II. c. 7. s. 6.

[2] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. and 4.

[3] Adv. Psych. c. 14.

subject, viz. the rise of the practice of fasting on Saturdays in the Western Church.

Only let me first ask, what authority there is for saying that Saturday was kept a festival as well as Sunday by the primitive Christians, if we cast aside these spurious documents,—this sixty-sixth Canon, and the Constitutions, and the forgeries which pass under the name of Ignatius? All that I gather on this subject, from the Epistles of Ignatius and Barnabas, from Pliny's Letter, from Justin and Irenæus, from Clement of Alexandria and Origen, from Tertullian and Cyprian, leads me to the opposite conclusion. The earliest writer, to whom Bingham refers in support of the notion, is Athanasius, after whose time the practice appears to have prevailed in the Eastern Church. If the practice had then been established, Saturday, surely, as well as Friday, would have been noticed, together with the Lord's day, in the edict of Constantine.

But, to turn to the consideration of the opposite practice in the Western Church: Tertullian, in his Treatise on Prayer, informs us, that a difference of usage had been introduced by some very few, who did not kneel in prayer on Saturdays; whereas it was on Sundays, and during the interval between Easter and Whitsuntide only, that the Church used the standing posture when they prayed; and he adds a hope that this question[1] might be examined and settled before

[1] Quæ dissentio quum maxime apud Ecclesias causam dicat, Dominus dabit gratiam suam, ut aut cedant, aut sine aliorum scandalo sententiâ suâ utantur. De Orat. c. 23. The rest of the passage has already been given.

the Churches, and so, by the grace of God, these persons might be brought to comply with the general practice, or be left to follow their own course, without giving offence to others. Afterwards, when, having separated from the Church as a Montanist, he wrote his Treatise on Fasts against the orthodox, Psychicos, as he calls them, natural men, guided by natural reason only, assuming to himself and his party the character of spiritual, he makes it a charge against them, that they devoted Saturday to fasting, *if at any time* they so prolonged the Friday's fast. In the first of these passages, then, we find a hope that the Church would settle the question, whether Saturday might be kept as a *festival*, so far as this was done by using the posture in prayer which belonged to high festivals alone: in the second, we find Saturday sometimes kept as a *fast* by the orthodox; this not yet being the constant practice. This second passage [1], as it seems to have

[1] Cur stationibus quartam et sextam sabbati dicamus, et jejuniis parasceuen? quanquam vos etiam sabbatum, si quando continuatis, nunquam nisi in Pascha jejunandum, secundum rationem alibi redditam; nobis certe omnis dies etiam vulgatâ consecratione celebratur. Adv. Psych. c. 14.

There appear to have been three kinds of fasts; *statio*, when no food was taken till three in the afternoon; *jejunium*, when none was taken till the day closed at sun-set; *xerophagiæ*, when they abstained from all but dry meats, taking bread only and water, (Ibid. c. 11 and 13.) To these we may add the *superpositiones*, or continuance of the day's fast throughout the succeeding day: and, as these sometimes lasted for five days together, the people kept them as *xerophagiæ*, living only on bread and water. This carrying the day's fast over to the morrow, is

been much mistaken, I will give at large. "If," says he, "the Apostle had altogether condemned the observance of times, and days, and months, and years, why do we, in the first month of every year, keep Easter? why the high festival for the fifty days following? Why do we devote Wednesdays and Fridays to a fast till three in the afternoon, and Good Friday to a fast till sun-set? Though you, indeed, *if ever* you continue the Friday's fast, so devote the Sabbath also, a day on which we ought never to fast, except on that before Easter-day, for a reason elsewhere assigned, (viz. that Christians ought to fast only on the days when the bridegroom was taken away); we certainly keep every day also holy, as far as this can daily be done."

Thus we see the Western Church began to fast on Saturdays at the beginning of the third century. That the practice from this time forward gained ground even at Carthage, whence Tertullian wrote, I do not pretend to say: I find no mention of it in Cyprian: his exhortations to fasting are general, without notice of particular days: possibly his difference with the Church of Rome after the death of his friends, Cornelius and Lucius, and the elevation of Stephen to the popedom, and his connection with the synod of the Eastern Church at Iconium, with whom he was joined in a

called by Tertullian, *jejunia conjungere*, (de Patientiâ, c. 13,) or as above, *continuare*; by Victorinus, *superponere*, that is ὑπερτιθεσθαι, the only difference from the ordinary sense of this word being, that the fast, which is put over to the morrow, is not omitted on the day.

common cause by the violent opposition of Pope Stephen, these circumstances may have disinclined him from following the Western practice in this respect: certainly in a letter addressed to him[1] by Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, one of the members of that synod, with whom he appears to have perfectly agreed in opinion, it is said, "that many things are done at Rome which are not sanctioned by apostolical authority, and are different from the practice at Jerusalem:" and it is not improbable that the Saturday fasts, which never were adopted by the Eastern Church, may have been among the things here alluded to. At a much later period, we learn from[2] Austin, that the practice was greatly varied in Africa, so that even of members of the same Church, some used to dine, others to fast, on a Saturday.

However this may have been, in Cyprian's time, (and many reasons may be assigned for his silence on a matter which, though new, was not, in Africa at least, thought important) towards the close of this century, Victorinus, Bishop of Pettaw in Styria, speaks of fasting on Saturdays as the established practice. "The sixth day of the week, the preparation day," says he, "on account of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, we dedicate to God as a fast till three, or till sun-set. The seventh day he rested from all his works and blessed it, and sanctified it. On this day our practice is to continue the fast of the day preceding, to the intent that on the Lord's

[1] Cypriani, Epist. 75.
[2] Bingham's Antiq. B. XX. c. 3. s. 6.

day we may go forth to break bread with thanksgiving. And let Friday's fast be so continued, lest we should appear to keep the Sabbath with the Jews [1]." And a few years afterwards, at the Council of Eliberis in the south of Spain, it was resolved to correct their erro-

[1] Dies sextus, parasceue appellatur—Hoc die ob passionem Domini Jesu Christi aut stationem Deo aut jejunium facimus. Die septimo requievit ab omnibus operibus suis, benedixit eum et sanctificavit. Hoc die solemus superponere; idcirco, ut die Dominico cum gratiarum actione ad panem exeamus. Et parasceue superpositio fiat, ne quid cum Judæis sabbatum observare videamur. And above—usque ad horam nonam jejunemus, aut usque ad vesperam, aut superpositio usque in alterum diem fiat. Victorini Fragmentum. Routh's Reliquiæ Sacræ. III. p. 237, 236. Errorem placuit corrigi, ut omni sabbati die superpositiones celebremus. Concil. Elib. Ibid. IV. p. 50. At this Council it was determined that *jejuniorum superpositiones*, that is *xerophagiæ*, should be kept through every month, except July and August. In the above passages from Tertullian and Victorinus, we find *continuare* and *superponere* used technically, it being necessary in each case to supply the words they govern, *jejunium pridianum*.

In his treatise Adv. Psych. c. 2. Tertullian, speaking of the Church, says, "As to fasts, they object that certain days are appointed by God.—They think that in the Gospel those days are set apart for fasting, on which the bridegroom was taken away, and that these are now the only lawful days of Christian fasts, the oldness of the law and the prophets being abolished. For when they choose, they understand what means the text, "the law and the prophets until John."

For *continuare*, or *continere*, or *conjungere*, used in the above sense by the Latin Fathers, the Greek use συνάπτειν; for *superponere*, ὑπερτιθέναι, or ὑπερτίθεσθαι.—Routh's Rel. Sacr. I. p 397—400.

neous practice, and on every Sabbath to continue the Friday's fast throughout the day. Victorinus, we see, ascribes this usage to a desire to have nothing in common with the Jews; but since the fasts on Friday and Saturday in Passion week, were considered as marked out by the words of Christ himself, as the days in which the bridegroom was taken away, and therefore were universally observed as the appointed Christian fasts, it seems to have been but natural, when the question was stirred in the Church, to resolve to keep the weekly return of these fasts, as they had been accustomed to keep the weekly return of the festival of the Resurrection.

But whatever may have been the cause, the practice of fasting on a Saturday appears to have grown up in the Western Church from the beginning of the third century: whereas the opposite practice of keeping that day a festival like Sunday, appears to have spread in the Eastern Church in the century following, towards the close of which, according to an extract from Austin, quoted by Bingham [1], it prevailed generally throughout the East, and the greater part of the Christian world. The only traces of it in Tertullian are in those very few [2], whose departure from the established usage in standing up at their prayers on that day, was to be settled by the Churches. He tells us, indeed [3], that the Montanists, the seceders from the Church whom he had joined, excepted Saturdays as well as Sundays in

[1] Antiq B. XX. c. 3. s. 1. [2] De Orat. c. 17.
[3] Adv. Psych. c. 15, 14, and 2.

their two weeks of *xerophagiæ;* but, as he has just before given the reason for the rule of fasting on no Saturday but that in Passion week, his party must be thought to have adopted this practice rather to mark the days on which the bridegroom was taken away, as the only *stated* Christian fasts, than to make other Saturdays festivals, which he does not say they did: though, to judge by another work [1] written also after his secession, in which he insists both that the provision of manna for the Sabbath at its institution (as he thought) shewed that it was not to be kept as a fast, and that Christ's permission to his disciples to pluck the corn, shewed that it was of more consequence to honour it by not making it sad, than by strict rest, (remarks which seem levelled against the rising practice of the orthodox,) it is likely the Montanists may even have feasted on the day from opposition to the judgment of the Church.

Such is the account I gather of the way in which Saturday was regarded by the ancient Christians; and I trust it will be seen that the account is confirmed, as I pursue the more immediate object of my enquiry, —the way in which they regarded Sunday. If Dr. Heylyn had known how little support for the opinion, that Saturday was observed as Sunday, could be derived from any genuine writings of the apostolic age, it might have made him more cautious, as he proceeded in the enquiry. As to the service of the Church on Sundays, he gives, indeed, the account of their con-

[1] Adv. Marcion. L. IV. c. 12.

gregations from the Apologies[1] of Justin and of Tertullian: but then he adds the following remarks; "We cannot learn from either of them how long these meetings lasted, or whether they assembled more than once a day, or what they did after the meetings were dissolved. But sure it is, that their assemblies held no longer than our morning service; that they met only before noon: for Justin saith, that when they met they used to receive the Sacrament; and that the service being done, every man went again to his daily labours." Does then Justin say, that the service being done, every man went again to his daily labours? Certainly not;—nor does Heylyn say he does. It is a curiously constructed sentence, which conveys this impression to the reader without committing the writer, who is safe in the declarations of the preceding sentence. How then was Heylyn sure that they met only before noon? His argument from their receiving the Sacrament may seem good now-a-days, but he would have found cause to mistrust it, if he had consulted Tertullian, who tells us that they used to receive the Sacrament[2] of the Eucharist both at the time of their meal and *at all their meetings*, even those before day-

[1] Just. Mart. Apol. 1ma, (vulgo 2da), ad fin. and Tertull. Apologeticus Adv. Gentes. c. 39.

[2] Eucharistiæ sacramentum, et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis, cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu, quam præsidentium sumimus. De Coron. Mil. c. 3. That it was the custom to receive the sacrament in the evening and after supper, as well as in the morning, appears from Cyprian. Epist. 63.

break, being what was commanded by the Lord; and he would have been less sure, that after service every man went again to his daily labour, if he had only attended to a passage from that writer, to which he has himself referred just before: "If you need bodily indulgence, every eighth day is your holiday." The passage (De Idololatriâ, c. 14,) has already been given. We may here, however, observe upon it, that it distinctly speaks of Sunday only as the weekly holiday for Christians, and also declares that they had nothing to do with the Saturday Sabbath of the Jews. Another passage (De Orat. c. 17,) which also has been quoted, declaring, that on the Lord's day they used to put off all business, plainly disproves the point of which Dr. Heylyn was so sure.

Though little can be gathered of the opinions of Irenæus on this subject, yet, as I have before referred to him as asserting the perpetual obligation of the Decalogue, that little shall be stated, lest his authority on the one hand should seem unfairly claimed to support, or on the other should be unreasonably supposed adverse to, the doctrine here maintained. And the question is, What are the duties to which he thought Christians bound by the fourth commandment? Now in the chapter immediately preceding that on the difference between the Decalogue and other precepts of the law, speaking of the abolition of the Sabbaths, he says[1], they were designed to teach us to persevere in serving God the whole day, all the time of our life, and

[1] Iren. adv. Hæres. IV. 30.

to foreshow that rest of God, his kingdom, in which, whoever has so persevered, resting from his labours, will be made a partaker of God's table: and in other places also he speaks of "the times of the kingdom[1], as the hallowed seventh day, the true Sabbath of the righteous," which he thought, as Barnabas and others did, was to begin when the world had lasted six days, that is, six thousand years. But there is nothing here to lead us to imagine, that he did not regard it a part of that duty of daily service, to worship God more especially on his weekly hallowed festival. The practice of standing up to pray on the Lord's day, we have seen, he declared derived from the apostolic age; and when Victor, Bishop of Rome, had convened a council to determine the day on which the yearly festival of Easter should be celebrated, Irenæus[2], in the name of the Churches over which he presided, sent him an Epistle, to maintain that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated on the Lord's day alone. The day then was held in much veneration by him.

That the primitive Christians regarded the Lord's day substituted for, and preferred above the ancient Sabbath, appears from their very language respecting it, as a type of the heavenly rest; sometimes, by a little confusion of thought, making it, instead of the Sabbath, a type of that rest in the Millennium; (as[3] Africanus

[1] Iren. adv. Hæres. V. 30, 33, and 28.
[2] Euseb. Hist. V. 23. See Routh's Rel. Sacr. I. p. 394.
[3] Routh's Rel. Sacr. II. p. 126.

of Emmaus, says, the length of life of Methuselah, the eighth from Adam, perhaps foreshows the Lord's day, as it is the heavenly eighth day, what his life wanted to make up a thousand years, being supplied by Christ); sometimes [1], with more accuracy, according to their notion of the world lasting six thousand years, making the Sabbath a sign of the Millenium, the first resurrection, after which comes the real and never-ending eighth day, the true Lord's day, (of which what we weekly observe is a type), commencing in the general resurrection, and entrance of the just into the glorious kingdom of God the Father.

But to return to Dr. Heylyn's book. From the writings of Clement of Alexandria he produces two extracts, which he conceives entirely support his opinion. What is the correct inference to be drawn from them, will be best seen from the extracts themselves. They are taken from the seventh book of his Stromateis [2], or Patch-works of Miscellaneous Discourses. In this book Clement is speaking of the perfect Christian, one who is perfect in the true knowledge; the Gnostic, as he calls him, though that name is usually employed to designate, not the orthodox, but an heretical sect, who piqued themselves on their acquisition of knowledge,

[1] Routh's Rel. Sacr. III. p. 251. and Hilarii Præf. in Psalm. s. xi. xii. and xvi.

[2] These books, I know not why, are commonly called Stromata; the name given them by Clement is as I have written it: each book is στρωματεὺς, or a patch-work of discourses, stitched together as they came into his mind, without studied order or arrangement.

falsely so called. The Gnostic of Clement, however, is the orthodox and perfect Christian. He describes him[1] as a man of prayer: "If some have set apart for prayer certain definite hours, as, for instance, the third, the sixth, the ninth; yet the Gnostic passes his whole life in prayer, seeking by prayer to be ever with God." And again[2], "He prays with angels, as being already equal to the angels; nor is he ever unattended by these holy guardians; and though he prays alone, has a chorus of angels standing by his side." But though I have thus dwelt on the duty of prayer, as particularly belonging to the subject before me, it must be understood also that the gnostic gives proof of the religious principle within him in all his conduct; and Clement's design is, by setting forth the loveliness of this character, to win all men to the true worshipping of the eternal God, with whose excellent Majesty he contrasts the vain and false objects of heathen superstition. He exposes the unsuitableness of fancying, as the heathens did, that the Almighty can be represented by the likeness of any earthly form, or that he, who is every where present, can be enclosed within the limits of a temple made with hands. "Since[3]," says he, "the Holy One, in its two senses, signifies or God himself, or what is built for His honour, why do we not call the Church, which through knowledge is made holy for his honour, —why do we not call the Church, as by its appropriate name, the holy of God, being, as it is, of great price, and not built by any mechanic's skill, nor decked by

[1] L. VII. c. 7. [2] Ibid. c. 12. [3] Ibid. c. 5.

any juggler's hand, but made for a temple by the will of God. By the Church I now mean, not the place, but the congregation of saints." He exposes the unsuitableness of imagining that the Almighty can be pleased with the sacrifice of animals, alleging that the sacrifices which were made under the law were but typical of the spiritual offerings of the Christian Church. "For the sacrifice of the Church is prayer, the incense of holy spirits, when, together with the sacrifice, the whole mind is laid open before God[1]." "Our offerings to God should be not costly, but godly." After such remarks as these, he breaks forth in the first of the passages[2] selected by Dr. Heylyn. ["It is our duty, as we are commanded, to worship and honour him, whom we are persuaded to be the Word, our Saviour and our Captain, and through him the Father; doing this, not at selected times, as some others do, but continually, during our whole lives, and in every way. Certainly the chosen race, which was justified according to the commandment, says, 'Seven times a day have I praised thee.' Wherefore, the Gnostic honours God, not in definite places or chosen temples, nor yet on certain feasts and appointed days, but all his life, in every place, both when he may be by himself alone,] and wherever he may meet any who have embraced the same faith, he does this, giving thanks for the knowledge of the rule of life. If the presence of a good man, by his reverential and decorous behaviour, continually improves those who associate with him, how

[1] L. VII. c. 6. [2] Ibid. c. 7.

much rather, in all reason, shall not he, who, by knowledge, and manner of life, and eucharist, is ever present with God, be continually improving in every particular, in his actions, and his words, and his disposition. Such is he, who is persuaded that God is everywhere present, and fancies not that He is shut up in certain definite places, so that, supposing himself ever out of His presence, he may give way to licentiousness by night or by day. [We then, making our whole lives a festival, persuaded that God is everywhere present, praise Him as we toil in the fields, praise Him as we sail on the sea, in any other mode of life have our conversation according to rule."] The other passage[1] to which Dr. Heylyn refers, is in a later part of the book. "The Gnostic," says Clement, "understands the mystical meaning of the fasts on the fourth and sixth days of the week. The one is called the day of Mercury, the other of Venus. Hence he continually fasts from avarice and from lust, the sources of all vice." And then, after dwelling a little on these topics, he thus proceeds: "Such a [one, having fulfilled the command according to the Gospel, makes that day the Lord's day, on which he casts off evil thoughts, and takes those which are according to knowledge, glorifying the Lord's resurrection as wrought in himself."]

The portions of the above passages which are quoted by Dr. Heylyn, I have included within brackets; but it seemed necessary to give them more fully than he has done, with some account of the argument in which

[1] L. VII. c. 12.

they are introduced, in order that a judgment may be formed of the real meaning of the writer. If Dr. Heylyn had done so in the several extracts he has made, he would probably have come nearer to the truth; and here certainly would not have thought the Gnostic was "one who understands himself" (an expression, which shews the translator did not understand Clement, and had taken no pains to understand him, though he considered him as one of the writers "which give us any thing of the Lord's day") and perhaps would have avoided some other mistranslations. But I chiefly blame him for omitting, in the first of the two passages, what would have served to guide his readers to the general sense of the whole, though that of the word Gnostic had remained in obscurity. Looking to the fine vein of piety here displayed, it seems an injustice to the writer to suppose that he designed to slight the ordinances of the Church. I believe, rather, Clement was only contending against a superstitious and erroneous adherence to appointed places and times; that he was guarding against the notion, that public prayers supersede the necessity of private devotions, or that, because the worship of God is to be performed at Church, and on Sundays or other holy days, it is, therefore, to be confined to that place or those times. Doubtless, the Royal Psalmist, when he praised God seven times a day, did not neglect the hours appointed in the Jewish Church, but prayed in the evening, and morning, and at noon-day, and that instantly; and so would Clement have the true Christian a man of continual prayer. But if any think they

perceive with Heylyn, from the above extracts, that Clement "was well enough contented that the Lord's day should not be observed at all;" they must at least allow, that he was writing to those who knew the place of public worship by the name of the Church, and who regarded Wednesdays and Fridays as the weekly fasts, and the Lord's day as the weekly holy festival.

But, before any decision is formed, what were the real sentiments of Clement on this subject, let one other extract be taken from his works. Towards the latter part of the sixth book of his Stromateis [1], in a brief commentary on the Decalogue, he says, "The fourth commandment tells us, that the world was made by God, and that he gave us the seventh day as a rest, because of the sufferings and afflictions of our lives. For God has no fatigue, no suffering, no need; but we, as bearing the flesh, have need of rest. Therefore, the seventh day is declared to be the rest, the cessation of evil, to prepare for that day [2], that brought a new beginning; that is our real rest; which is also the first origin of the real Light, by whom all things are seen, and all things received as our inheritance: from this day the primest wisdom and knowledge

[1] L. VI. c. 16.

[2] *τὴν ἀρχιγόνον ἡμέραν*. I have rendered this word as if it were so accented. The Latin translator has given two senses, as if it also occurred accented thus, *ἀρχίγονον*, "born of old, ordained of old to be born." The sense I have adopted I prefer, as perfectly agreeing with the language of Athanasius. The word I presume should be written *ἀρχεγόνον*.

enlighten us; for the Light of Truth, the true, unshadowed Light, the Spirit of the Lord, divided without division to those who are sanctified through faith, is like a lamp for the knowledge of the things that are: following this, then, through the whole of our lives, we are set free from affliction; and this is, to rest. . . . . Since[1] we have arrived at this point, to be speaking of the seventh and eighth day, we must briefly call to mind this also—for the eighth day seems properly to be called the seventh, and the seventh, as it appears manifest, the sixth; and the former to be properly the Sabbath, but the seventh a working day." These remarks, in a commentary too on the fourth commandment, may surprise those, who think the Lord's day was not substituted for the Jewish Sabbath in the age of Clement of Alexandria, and that the old Sabbath was still observed. The passage, indeed, is so clear and express, that unless its genuineness be questioned, it must put an end to all further controversy on the subject. It is true this commandment is here called the fourth, though only two are numbered before it, but in the brief commentary on those two, the substance of the three first is evidently given; the commandment, too, next following, is called the fifth; and though the ninth is omitted, or rather, its subject forestalled in the fanciful remarks on the eighth, the last

[1] Ἐνταῦθα γενομένους ἐν παρέργῳ καὶ ταῦτα ὑπομνηστέον, ἐπεὶ περὶ ἑβδομάδος καὶ ὀγδοάδος ὁ λόγος παρεισῆλθε· κινδυνεύει γὰρ ἡ μὲν ὀγδοὰς ἑβδομὰς εἶναι κυρίως· ἑξὰς δὲ ἡ ἑβδομάς, κατά γε τὸ ἐμφανές· καὶ ἡ μὲν κυρίως εἶναι σάββατον, ἐργάτις δὲ ἡ ἑβδομάς.—Strom. L. VI. c. 16.

is distinctly called the tenth. The inaccuracy, then, as to the number (calling it the fourth) is of no moment; nor may it be thought, that the commandment was not called the fourth in Clement's days; for in a homily [1] on the beginning of the Decalogue, his pupil, Origen, tells us, some persons reckoned the first and second commandments as one only, but he himself divides them into two, as we divide them, in order, as he says, to make up the number of the ten commandments. It may seem strange, perhaps, that the name of the Sabbath should be applied to the Lord's day by Clement of Alexandria, more distinctly than the bishop of that city, Athanasius, has thought fit to do, when writing on the very subject above a century afterwards: but if the passage has been received on the authority of ancient manuscripts, it is not to be rejected, because it contains what we should not have expected; and it stands unquestioned in the edition of Archbishop Potter. Certainly, though we might not have expected the expression, the idea, that the Lord's day was to be kept as the only weekly festival, is no more than is said, in one form or another, by all the writers of the three first centuries, who have touched on the subject.

But it is time to pass on to the works of Origen, from which Heylyn gives us two extracts. The first is from his tenth Homily on Genesis. Origen, having observed, that Rebekah coming to draw water from the well, according to her daily custom, so ob-

[1] Orig. in Exod., Hom. VIII. c. 2.

tained her marriage with the Patriarch Isaac, hence takes occasion to impress on his audience the duty of coming daily to draw the water of life from the sacred well, that they may be married to Christ. [" Tell me[1]," says he, " ye who come together at Church on festivals only, are not the other days festivals? are not they also the Lord's days? To observe particular days, and a few yearly festivals, is the practice of Jews.] And, therefore, God says to them, 'Your new-moons, and Sabbaths, and the great day, I cannot away with: the fast, and the holydays, and your appointed feasts, my soul hateth.' God, then, hateth those who think, that one day is the Lord's festival day. [Christians every day eat the flesh of the Lamb; that is, daily feed on the Word of God.] For Christ has been slain our Passover." It is scarcely necessary to observe, that this address is made to persons who were in the habit of going to Church regularly on the Lord's day, and no other; whereas Origen wished to bring them to the habit of attending the service every day.

The second extract is from his celebrated vindication of the Christian religion against Celsus, an Epicurean, who wrote in the age of Adrian or the Antonines: among his serious charges against the Christians, the heathen philosopher had said, that theirs was a dark, mysterious society, marked neither by altars, nor by images, nor by temples. To this Origen, in the style and spirit of his master Clement, replies[2], that Christ-

[1] In Genesim, Hom. X. s. 3.

[2] Contra Celsum, L. VIII. c. 17, 18.

ians had their altars, and images, and temples—that the minds of believers are their altars, from which the incense of righteous prayers may go up before God; that the images suitable to the Almighty are not those which are fashioned by mechanic artists, but those which are formed within our own bosoms by imitation of the divine excellence, and which lead us to adore the Holy One, after whose image we are formed; and that the Christian's temple must be suitable to such images and altars[1]; "that no mass of dead and senseless matter can be a fit building for the Author of life; but, as the body of Christ was most truly the Temple of God, so the company of all faithful Christians are His precious Temple, the several individuals as lively stones, being builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Churches, indeed, called too by this name, as we have already seen, both from Origen and Clement, they had in these days: but the unadorned, unpretending places of their public worship in these days of the Church's poverty, could not be compared with the magnificent structures of heathen superstition: against these temples then, these stately and splendid buildings, the Christians set the spiritual building, as far more important, and more worthy of the Most High. From this subject Origen passes on to the reasons, why Christians cannot be present at the sacrifices offered by heathens to their idols. For Celsus had said, that since God is the common Lord of all, they who are most devoted to his service, ought

[1] Contra Celsum, L. VIII. c 19, 20.

to be present at public festivals; and Origen admits that, *we ought to be present at these*, if it be proved that they have nothing of error in them, but have been appointed from a knowledge of God, as agreeable to his worship and true piety, but not, if this be otherwise and they be but the fancies of men. "A festival," adds he[1], "as some Greek philosopher has said, is nothing else than this, to do one's duty: and [he truly keeps festivals, who does his duty, continually praying, and ever offering up the bloodless sacrifice in his prayers to God.] Wherefore, it seems to me to have been most nobly said by St. Paul, 'Ye observe days and months and times and years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed labours upon you in vain.'"

But[2] if any one should object against this what takes place amongst ourselves on the Lord's days, or on Preparation days, or on the days of the Passover, or of Pentecost, the answer is, that the perfect Christian, [who continually lives in the words and works, and thoughts of the Word of God, his natural Lord, continually lives in His days, daily keeps a Lord's day.] He, moreover, who continually prepares himself to live according to truth, and abstains from the pleasures of life, that deceive the many, and does not feed the desire of the flesh, but keeps under his body and brings it into subjection, this man daily keeps a

[1] Contra Celsum, L. VIII. c. 21.

[2] *Ἐὰν δέ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρῃ τὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν κυριακῶν, ἢ παρασκευῶν, ἢ τοῦ πάσχα, ἢ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς δι' ἡμερῶν γινόμενα· λεκτέον καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτι ὁ μὲν τέλειος κ. τ. λ.* Ibid. c. 22.

Preparation day. He, too, who has considered, that Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us, and that it is our duty to keep the feast by eating the flesh of the Word,—there is not a day when he does not keep the Passover, continually in his thoughts and every word and every action passing over from this life's affairs towards God, and hastening towards His city. And further, he who is able with truth to say, "We have risen with Christ," and moreover, "He hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ," such a one day by day is in the feast of Pentecost; then especially, when going up into an upper room, like the Apostles of Jesus, he has no business to interrupt his supplication and prayer, that he may become worthy of the rushing mighty wind from heaven, which compels the vice of man and its consequences to vanish away; worthy also of some portion of the fiery tongue from God."

He then goes on to say that[1] the generality of those who pass for believers, will not, or cannot, thus keep holy every day, but need some sensible signs to bring these things to their remembrance: and this, which he calls keeping the feast in part only, he thinks St. Paul alluded to by the expression "in part of an holy day." Col. ii. 16. But what follows, is not connected with the subject of our enquiry.

Of the above passages from Origen I have, as before, included between brackets all that is given by Dr. Heylyn. As to the first of them, no great fault is to

[1] Contra Celsum, L. VIII. c. 23.

be found with him on account of what he has omitted. The declaration, indeed, that God hates those who regard one day alone in the week as the Lord's day, falls in with his notions well enough: I suspect, however, he could not so easily reconcile with them the comparison of the Jewish festivals, and of their Sabbaths too, with the Lord's day, as observed by the Christians at Alexandria. But for the omission in the second passage, where it is not even acknowledged that any thing has been omitted at all,—I have no wish to say what impression the discovery of it made: I have no wish to bring a railing accusation against one long ago departed, and who always, I believe, stood high in the esteem of those who knew him: but I have a strong wish, that a book, professing to teach us, how the Lord's day ought to be observed, by teaching us, how it has been observed from the beginning, and yet so grossly misrepresenting the very authorities to which it appeals, should no longer be suffered to pass unexposed, and to spread its noxious influence in the English Church. The passage itself scarcely requires any comment: it plainly tells us that in the judgment of Origen, Christians ought to keep such festivals, as promote the worship of God and true piety, though they ought not to consider the observance of these alone as the whole business of religion, but daily to worship the Lord: it plainly tells us, that the Christians at Alexandria used to keep two great yearly festivals, Easter and Whitsuntide; and two principal days in the week, Sunday, the Lord's day, as a holy festival; Friday, the Preparation day, as a fast. Fri-

day, the day on which our Lord was crucified, was, it seems, more regarded every week in this age, than Wednesday, the day on which Judas covenanted to betray him: and so it was afterwards, as is evident from the edict of Constantine. I do not mean that Wednesday's fast was altogether neglected. It is mentioned, as we have seen, by Clement: it is mentioned also by Peter[1], who was Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 300. "No one shall blame us," says he, "for keeping Wednesday and Friday, on which, according to tradition, it has, with good reason, been appointed to us to fast; on Wednesday, because of the counsel taken by the Jews for betraying our Lord; on a Friday, because of his suffering for us. But the Lord's day we keep as a festival, because of his resurrection on it, on which day we have learnt not to bend the knee." Not a word is here said of Saturday. But Dr. Heylyn having made his quotation from Origen, is pleased to say of the Alexandrian Christians, "Of Sunday there is little doubt, but that it was observed amongst them; and so was Saturday also." Why then did neither Clement, nor Origen, nor Bishop Peter mention Saturday? But Dr. Heylyn refers us to Athanasius, who lived about a hundred years after Origen's time. The passage we will consider in its place.

But, before we lay Origen aside, it may be well to make a third extract from his writings. In his seventh Homily on Exodus, he speaks of the gathering of manna, and the double portion on the sixth day, and thus pro-

[1] Routh's Rel. Sacr. III. 343.

ceeds[1]: "It is clear that the day before the Sabbath is called the sixth day, which we call the Preparation day, but the Sabbath is the seventh day; I ask then, on what day manna was first given from heaven, and wish to compare our Lord's day with the Jewish Sabbath. For it is plain from Holy Writ, that manna was first given on earth on the Lord's day. For if, as the Scripture says, it was gathered six successive days, and there was none on the seventh day, without doubt it began to be given on the first day of the week, which is the Lord's day. But if it be clear from the holy Scriptures, that God rained manna from heaven on the Lord's day, and rained none on the Sabbath day, let the Jews understand, that from that time our Lord's day was set above the Jewish Sabbath; from that time the fact was shewn, that on their Sabbath days no grace of God has fallen on them from heaven, no heavenly bread, which is the word of God, has come to them. For the prophet says elsewhere, The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, without a prince, without a prophet, without an offering, without a sacrifice, without a priest. For on our Lord's day, God always rains down manna from heaven—but at this very day, I say, God rains down manna from heaven—for the discourses, which are delivered to us, are from heaven; and the words, which are preached to us, have come down from God; and hence we are blessed in receiving such manna."

This being the language of the early Fathers, I

[1] In Exodum. Hom. VII. s. 5.

would ask, what colour of reason there is for saying that the Sabbath was held in equal honour with the Lord's day in the Primitive Church? All that we learn from Cyprian on this subject, perfectly agrees with what has gone before. The first passage Dr. Heylyn has given from this writer, I presume he has taken from an incorrect edition: I will therefore translate it, having first stated the circumstances from which it arose. In the seventh persecution of the Christians, which took place under the Emperor Decius, Cyprian, being proscribed by name as Bishop of the Christians, withdrew from the fury of the storm, retired from Carthage, and lived in concealment. This conduct, which was censured by some of the[1] Roman Clergy, he adopted not from regard for his personal safety alone, but because he thought that if he remained concealed[2], the Church would the sooner regain her peace, since his presence seemed chiefly to have provoked the violation of it. In his retirement, however, he did not neglect the duties of his diocese, but communicated by letter both with the clergy and with the whole body of his Church. Such was his letter on the case of Aurelius, a young man of high merit, who had proved the sincerity of his faith by his fortitude in confessing it under the torture of the rack. Cyprian, with his colleagues, who were with him, having ordained this young man to the office of Reader, writes to inform his Church of what, he is sure, would be acceptable to them, and to request them to strive

[1] Epist. II. [2] Ibid. XIV. and XXXVI.

together with him in their prayers, that through the favour of God he himself might shortly be restored to them in safety, and bring with him the martyr Reader, who, he says[1], "since joy is always eager, and delight ill brooks delay, reads meanwhile on a Lord's day to us; that is, while he consecrates his powers as a Reader, he has already entered on the duties which belong to times of peace." It must have been uncertain how long this arrangement was to last, yet no mention is made of Saturday; it is only said, Aurelius was to read to Cyprian, and those who were with him, on the Lord's day.

There is nothing in the second passage, quoted by Heylyn, which bears upon our purpose. Cyprian[2], rebuking the wealthy matrons, who had neglected the duty of almsgiving, breaks forth in the following words:—"You are rich and wealthy; and do you imagine you keep the Lord's day, while you altogether neglect to bring a gift,—while you come to the Lord's house without a sacrifice, and partake of the offering, that the poor man has made?" The passage shews, that the place of public worship was called the Lord's house; but the words here translated "keep the Lord's day," *Dominicum celebrare*, in his sixty-third Epistle, signify to celebrate the Lord's supper, or the Lord's sacrifice, and this, no doubt, is their meaning here also.

[1] Et quoniam semper gaudium properat, nec potest moras ferre lætitia, Dominico legit interim nobis; id est, auspicatus est pacem, dum dedicat lectionem. Epist. XXXIII.

[2] De opere et eleemosynis. Cypr. Opera. p. 259. Paris. 1648.

Dr. Heylyn finding that, in a third passage, Cyprian represents "the Lord's day as prefigured in the eighth day, destinate to circumcision," says he "shall rather refer the reader to the place than repeat the words." We will follow his direction. Fidus, one of the clergy of the Church of Carthage, having maintained that infants ought not to be baptized before the eighth day, according to the law of circumcision, Cyprian convened a council, in which this opinion was unanimously condemned; and writing to inform Fidus of their decision[1], he added, that "the observance of the eighth day, in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh, is a sacred mystery, sent beforehand in a shadow and a figure, but realized in the truth by the coming of Christ. For the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, which was to be the day on which the Lord should rise again, and bring us to life, and give us the circumcision of the Spirit; this eighth day, that is, the first after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day, came before in a figure; which figure ceased when the Truth was afterwards come, and the circumcision of the Spirit given us." To obviate the force of what Cyprian has thus expressly declared, Dr. Heylyn says, "It is but a private opinion of his own." An opinion, expressed in a synodical Epistle, does not look much like a private opinion. But further: Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, speaking of circumcising on

[1] Epist. LIX In the above passage I have rendered *sacramentum* as equivalent to *μύστηριον*, the word used by Justin; as in the Vulgate, Eph. v. 32.—Routh's Rel. Sacr. III. p. 76.

the eighth day, says, "We[1] may shew that the eighth day had a mystic sacredness above the seventh, thus proclaimed by God." Athanasius, too, in his Homily on the Sabbath and Circumcision, says, "Abraham, having believed, received the circumcision, a sign of the regeneration wrought in baptism. Wherefore, when that which was signified was come, the sign was done away. Now circumcision was the sign; the washing of regeneration the thing signified. For when the old man was wholly put off, the sign of putting this off in part was no longer needed. And as the Lord's day, the beginning of the new creation, put an end to the Sabbath, so the same day by the regeneration of man put an end to circumcision. For both were accomplished on the eighth day, the beginning of the creation and the regeneration of man. Wherefore the eighth day set aside the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath the eighth day: for the Sabbath was interrupted by circumcision, but circumcision was not interrupted by the Sabbath: for the eighth day, being the beginning of the new creation, put an end to what was before." Again, even in the age when the practice of making Saturday a holy festival was spreading in the Church, Austin[2] says, "Christ, by rising again on the third day, which we call the Lord's day, which, coming after the Sabbath, is numbered as the eighth day, declared that circumcision also on the eighth day was appointed to

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. p. 47. & p. 59. Justini M. Opera. Paris. Steph. 1551. The last of these two passages is quoted by Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Vol. II. p. 341. Oxf. 1797.

[2] Routh's Relliq. Sacr. III., p. 120.

prophecy of Himself." Thus we see this notion held by different writers, through two centuries and a half. Athanasius, indeed, and Austin, might have borrowed it from their predecessors; but Heylyn has omitted to tell us how Justin got hold of this private opinion of Cyprian's own. Perhaps he thought a private opinion is like private property, passing by descent or otherwise continually onwards, the possession of one man in one age, of another in another, according to the old Epigram:

> Κλῆρος Ἰουστίνου γενόμην ποτὲ, νῦν Κυπριάνου,
> Καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἑτέρου βήσομαι εἰς ἕτερον.
>
> "I, Justin's once, but Cyprian's to-day,
> From other hence to other pass away."

Yet there is not the slightest reason to suppose, but that an opinion, maintained in different ages and in different countries, was a general opinion in the early Christian Church, even if it had not been expressed in a synodical Epistle. In itself, indeed, it seems too fanciful to be thought of much importance; but considered together with the remark of Origen on the first fall of manna, it seems to shew, that, in the judgment of these Fathers, we "through the law are dead" to whatever obligation the law imposed of keeping a Sabbath on the seventh day, since the law itself intimated, that the ancient Sabbath was to be displaced under the Christian covenant, by the eighth, the more blessed day.

To Athanasius, however, appeal is made to shew that Saturday was kept as a weekly festival; and this,

not only by Dr. Heylyn, but also by Bingham[1], who, it should be observed, brings him forward as the earliest writer in support of this opinion, the sixty-sixth apostolical Canon, and the Constitutions, being set aside. The place referred to is the exordium of his Homily "On the Seed:" and the inference they draw from it, is best refuted by the passage itself, when fully and fairly given.

"On the Sabbath day we had assembled together; not that we are infected with Judaism—for we have nothing to do with *false Sabbaths*[2]; but we had met on the Sabbath to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath. For, in ages past, the Sabbath was held in honour by them of old; but the Lord has transferred the day of the Sabbath to the Lord's day[3]. And it is not of ourselves that we think slightingly of the Sabbath; but it is the Prophet who rejects it, saying, 'Your new moons and your Sabbaths my soul hateth.'"

Has not this all the air of a casual meeting? Had it been the constant practice at Alexandria to meet on that day, would the Bishop have said, that they thought slightingly of the day? or, though it served to introduce the subject of the disciples passing through the field of corn on the Sabbath day, would he have so dwelt on the fact, that this was the day on which they had met? We have seen Saturday was not one of the days of their weekly meetings in the time of Origen:

[1] Bingham's Antiq. B. XX. c. 3, s. 1, and B. XIII. c. 9, s. 3.

[2] Amos vi. 3. Septuag. Version.

[3] Πάλαι μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τὸ τίμιον Σάββατον· μετέθηκε δὲ ὁ Κύριος τὴν τοῦ Σαββάτου ἡμέραν εἰς Κυριακήν.—De Semente.

Sunday and Friday are the only days mentioned by him: nor is Saturday noticed by Bishop Peter, who preceded Athanasius but a few years in the See.

Dr. Heylyn, indeed, correctly says, it was not a command of Christ, but his resurrection on the day, which transferred the Sabbath to the Lord's day; and he might have given a better reason than he has, for so interpreting Athanasius's words, by another extract from this same Homily. "We then hold in honour the Lord's day, on account of the Resurrection; but the Jews, to this hour, cling to the Sabbath, even after Isaiah has said, 'Your Sabbaths my soul hateth.' I hold nothing so unhallowed[1] as the Sabbath, which God has hated. *I mean not weekly returns of days*, but that which is reputed Judaism. For God hates not days, but those who do ill in them." Let it here be noted, Athanasius rejects the Sabbaths which God had rejected—the false Sabbaths—rest, without reference to public worship; but not the weekly returns of days, not the transferred observance of the Lord's day.

One other extract from this writer shall be taken from his Homily, before referred to, "On the Sabbath and Circumcision." In this Homily, after observing, that it had been ordained that the Sabbaths, which

[1] οὐδέν μοι κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ Σάββατον ὃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐμίσησεν· οὐ λέγω τοὺς κύκλους τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸν νομιζόμενον Ἰουδαϊσμόν.—The first of these clauses is rendered, by the Latin translator, "Nil mihi commune cum Sabbato." I conceive the correct translation to be, as I have given it: "I hold nothing common or unhallowed in comparison with the Sabbath."

were to be kept by the children of Israel [1] throughout their generations, were to be kept as long as the former creation was in force at Jerusalem, but when that other generation, mentioned in the Psalms [2], should come, they should no longer keep these Sabbaths of a day, but should look for the Sabbath of Sabbaths, in which the new creature should have no end, but should be manifested, and should enjoy an eternal festival; and that God [3] commanded not his new people to keep the Sabbath, the end or last day of the former creation, but *clearly pointed out* the Lord's day, the commencement of the new creation, by the resurrection of Christ, that the end of that, which has passed away, might be known, as is intimated by the Scriptural expressions, "the last days," and "the fulness or consummation of time;"—and after arguing both from the Sabbath not being violated by its appointed sacrifices or by circumcision, because these works were done in a knowledge of the will of God, and also from the day of atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month being called the Sabbath of Sabbaths; arguing, I say, from these facts, that the end and design of a Sabbath, was not so much rest, as confession and humiliation of the soul, and knowledge of God, he thus concludes: "He then gave them not the Sabbath for

[1] Exod. xxxi. 16. [2] Ps. cii. 18.

[3] Τῇ δὲ καινῇ κτίσει οὐκ ἐνετείλατο φυλάττειν Σάββατον· ἵνα τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ γινώσκῃ, ἀτελεύτητον δὲ ἐπίσταται τὴν ταύτην χάριν· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν, τουτέστι τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐδήλωσεν, ἵνα τὸ τέλος τῆς παρελθούσης γινώσκῃς.—De Sabbat. et Circumcis.

idleness' sake, but that they might know his rest from the creation. For God[1] commanded, saying, 'that ye may know, that on this day the Lord your God rested from the works which he had begun to do:' but he designed that they, knowing the end of this creation, should seek the beginning of another. For the Sabbath was the end of the first creation; but the Lord's day the beginning of the second, in which he created anew and regenerated the old man. [As then he commanded before, to keep the Sabbath day, in memory of the end of the former, we accordingly hold in honour the Lord's day, in memory of the beginning of the second creation.] For he did not add another creation, but made anew the old, and finished that which he had begun to do. Wherefore, on the sixth day, the things that came into being were finished; yet he rested on the seventh day from all; and in the Gospel, the Word, at his coming, says, 'I am come to finish the work.' For he that rested from all, signifies that something needs to be finished, which he finished when he came: for he says, in St. John's Gospel, 'The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works, that I do, bear witness of

[1] Ἐνετείλατο γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς λέγων, ἵνα γινώσκητε, ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κατέπαυσε Κύριος, ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ὧν ἤρξατο ποιῆσαι, ἤθελε δὲ αὐτοὺς, γινώσκοντας τὸ τέλος ταύτης, ἀρχὴν ζητεῖν ἑτέρας· τέλος μὲν οὖν τῆς προτέρας κτίσεως ἦν τὸ Σάββατον, ἀρχὴ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας, ἡ Κυριακὴ, ἐν ᾗ τὴν παλαίαν ἀνενεώσατο καὶ ἀνεκαίνισεν. Ὥσπερ οὖν ἐνετείλατο φυλάττειν πρότερον τοῦ Σαββάτου τὴν ἡμέραν, μνήμην οὖσαν τοῦ τέλους τῶν προτέρων, οὕτως τὴν Κυριακὴν τιμῶμεν, μνήμην οὖσαν ἀρχῆς δευτέρας ἀνακτίσεως.—De Sabbato et Circumcis.

me.' For the work was unfinished, if by Adam's sin man had died, but became finished when he was made alive. Wherefore, having[1] created anew what had been created in six days, he *consecrates to the new creation* the day, of which the Spirit before spake in the Psalm, saying, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made.' For, instead of the sun, it is God that rises to give light to the souls of all. And hence, in his life-giving passion, the sun appeared not, as if to tell the end of the former creation, and the beginning of that other, which had its dawn in the Saviour's rising; which, when the Prophet[2] saw, he exclaimed, 'Behold the man! the Rising is his name:' and again[3], 'To you that fear him, shall the Sun of Righteousness arise.' For this day belongs not to all, but to them that are dead unto sin, and alive unto the Lord.' After this he proceeds to say, that hence circumcision was appointed on the eighth day, as in the passage already adverted to. In this Homily, then, Athanasius speaks distinctly of the eternal Sabbath hereafter, and of the rest from sin here, which alone some suppose to be substituted for the Jewish Sabbath in the Christian covenant; and yet, if words can be express, he tells us, that God designed the Jewish Sabbath, the last day of the world's creation, to be kept only till the fall of the old Jerusalem; and that he clearly

[1] Διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἐν ἓξ ἡμέραις κτίσιν ἀνακαινίσας, ἡμέραν τίθησι τῇ ἀνακαινίσει, ἣν διὰ τοῦ Ψαλμοῦ προαναφωνεῖ λέγον τὸ Πνεῦμα· αὕτη ἡμέρα ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος· ἀνθ' ἡλίου γὰρ Θεὸς ἀνατέλλει, καταυγάζων τῇ ἑκάστου ψυχῇ.—De Sabbato et Circumcis.

[2] Zech. vi. 12, Septuag. Vers. [3] Mal. iv. 2.

pointed out and consecrated the Lord's day, the first day of the new creation, which was begun by Christ's resurrection, or, to use his own expression, in his Homily on the Seed, that God has transferred the Sabbath day to the Lord's day. Now, what is Dr. Heylyn's remark on the portion of this passage he has thought fit to select, which has been placed, as before, between brackets? Why, that Athanasius has contrasted the commanded honour to the Sabbath with a voluntary honour to the Lord's day! Yet reverence for the Lord's day is here expressed by another form only of the very same word, which, in the Homily on the Seed, is used to express, in the times of the old covenant, reverence for the Jewish Sabbath.

Dr. Heylyn seems to have borrowed this idea of voluntary honour from the decree of a Council at Macon in Burgundy, which he has set before us with great care. As this Council of Macon was held about the close of the sixth century, it is not very important to consider what opinions were maintained there, except they can be shewn to be agreeable to those of the Primitive Church. The Canon, however, alluded to, exhorts us to keep the Lord's day, the day of our new-birth, whereon we were delivered from the snares of sin;—the everlasting day of rest, typified in the Old Testament, by the seventh day, or Sabbath, and to be celebrated as the day, on which we were made, what at first we were not. It then proceeds in these words, "Let us, therefore, offer unto God our free and *voluntary* service, by whose great goodness we are freed from the gaol of error; not that the Lord

exacts it of us, that we should celebrate the day in corporal abstinence and rest from labour, who only looks that we should yield obedience to his holy will. However, if any man set at nought this our exhortation, be he assured, that God will punish him, as he hath deserved." Now, it looks very much as if some members of this synod had their scruples about the declaration; that the Lord does not exact from his people the observance of his day; scruples, which were lulled by the assurance, that God would punish those, who did not observe it according to the Canon. This conjecture, however, I pursue no further, having quoted the words merely because we shall find the notion of *voluntary* honour to the Lord's day, which they express, employed by Dr. Heylyn to warp a Homily of our Church from its plain and simple meaning, with as little colour of reason as he has here employed it to misinterpret a Homily of Athanasius.

On the Canon of the Laodicean Council (which I have already given in the Notes on my Sermon) Dr. Heylyn is pleased to observe that it commanded people "to rest from labour on the Lord's day, if at least they could, but as Christians still." The words "but" and "still," which give an entirely new turn to the sentence, he has inserted without any authority whatever; and the insertion is the more unjustifiable, as he has not chosen to produce the original, and so was to escape detection.

Bingham[1] supposes that the command given in this

[1] Antiq. of Christian Church, B. XIII. c. 9. s. 1. 3.

Canon to work on a Saturday, is to be understood with an exception for the time of Divine service, because it appears by some other Canons of the same Council, which he quotes, that the Scriptures, especially the Gospels, were to be read, the Eucharist administered, and during Lent, commemorations of Martyrs, whose festivals happening in the fast could not be kept, were to be made on that day in the same manner as on Sundays; and he finds from the Institutions of Cassian, that in the Egyptian Churches also the service on the Saturday was always the same as on the Lord's day, and that in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebais, though on other days they had only their evening and nightly congregations, on both of these days they used to meet at the third hour (nine in the morning) to celebrate the holy Communion: hence, he concludes, the same hour was kept also in the Church at Laodicea. But it should be observed, first, that Cassian, who wrote these institutions for his monasteries founded at Marseilles, A.D. 410, must have been travelling in Egypt towards thirty years, at least, after the Laodicean Council, which was held about the time of his birth, a difference in date of much importance in its bearing on the present point, considering that this was the very age, in which the practice of keeping Saturday a festival, was growing up in the East; and secondly, it is in the monasteries of Egypt, this service was attended on Saturdays, at nine in the morning. Whatever they who had leisure might have done, it is unreasonable to suppose that the working classes, that is, the great bulk of the members of the Church, were

exhorted to make Saturday a working day, and yet expected on it to attend Divine service, just as they would on Sundays.

We have now traced the opinions of the Church on the substitution of the Lord's day for the ancient Sabbath, from the earliest age to the time when the practice of keeping Saturday also as a religious festival began to prevail: as this practice must necessarily throw some obscurity on the subject of enquiry, and the opinions maintained gradually become less important in proportion to their distance from the apostolic age, I proceed no further in the investigation of the usage of these times, but only remark, that among the proofs Heylyn brings forward, that both days were alike observed, Gregory of Nyssa's remonstrance with his congregation, "With what face canst thou look on the Lord's day, who hast dishonoured the Sabbath? knowest thou not, that these days are sisters, and that whoever doth despise the one, doth affront the other?" this very remonstrance plainly shews that, even then, the Lord's day and not the other was generally observed: and, notwithstanding these strong expressions of Gregory, I am inclined to believe it a judicious remark of Archbishop[1] Usher, that, where the practice obtained, Saturday was kept festival, not as a Sabbath day, but as a sort of Preparation day for the Christian Sabbath.

Here then I would omit altogether the intermediate

[1] Ch. XI. of the Dissertation prefixed to his edition of Polycarp and Ignatius' Epistles, 1644.

ages, and procced at once to the era of the Reformation; but, since in the account of the first proceedings at least, on that occasion, we continually find other holy days mentioned together with the Lord's day, as if held in equal honour, it may be well to enquire briefly, into the origin of a practice, of which, except whatever degree of festival was kept during the fifty days of Pentecost, we have seen no trace in the Primitive Church.

That the festivals of Christmas and Ascension day, were observed in the fourth century, and then regarded as of great antiquity, is satisfactorily established by Bingham: but that Christmas day was not instituted by the Apostles, is probable, from the fact, that while in the West it was kept on the eighth of the *Calends* of January, (or the 25th of December,) in the East it was kept on the eighth of the *Ides*, (or the 6th of January) Epiphany day, till in Chrysostom's time they received the correct tradition of our Lord's nativity from the Western Church; a discrepancy of practice, which could not have arisen, if the day had been kept from the times of the Apostles, as it is not, like Easter, a moveable feast and depending on any nice observation of circumstances: besides, that it was unknown to Tertullian seems clear, because[1], where he upbraids the Christians for attending heathen festivals, specifying the Saturnalia and others which occurred at this very time of the year, the only Christian festivals he proposes to them instead, are their annual feasts of

[1] De Idololatriâ, c. 14.

Easter, with the fifty days following, and their weekly holy day. At what time Ascension day began to be singled out above the other days of Pentecost, it is difficult to determine; but Bingham shews us, that Austin regarded it as appointed either by the Apostles themselves, or by some plenary council of the Church. Anniversaries of the martyrdom of those who suffered for Christianity—their birth-days, as they were called—were observed from the earliest times, as we may gather from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp: and none can doubt but that, with other martyrs, the Apostles were most religiously remembered. This Epistle, indeed[1], assigns as a reason for the honour to the memory of Polycarp, that "he now, *with the Apostles*, in great triumph, glorifies God, even the Father, and gives praise to our Lord." The Holy Innocents' day is distinctly mentioned both by Origen and Cyprian. Of minor yearly festivals, Bingham tells us, those on the Dedication of Churches, began in the reign of Constantine: others are mentioned by writers towards the close of that century, to commemorate the Consecration of Bishops, which also were called their "birth-days," (and so we celebrate St. Paul's conversion, not his martyrdom): others, again, to return thanks for signal public blessings: but the days of the Annunciation and Purification of the Virgin, did not come into use, till about the sixth or seventh century.

Not to speak, however, of these minor festivals, even

[1] Smyrn. Eccles. Epist. ad fin.

the Saints' days were far from being on the same footing with Sundays. Though we may not confidently make the assertion of those dedicated to Apostles, the rest certainly were not general, but local. Sozomen says, different Churches had distinct festivals for their own peculiar martyrs. In his time, indeed, the greater festivals alone, with the fast of Passion-Week, were made Sabbath days. It was provided, in what are called the Apostolical Constitutions, that "servants were to rest from their labours on Christmas day, Epiphany, Passion and Easter weeks, Ascension day, Whitsun day, and every Lord's day, with (as we might expect in these Constitutions) the Sabbath: and, during[1] the fifty days of Pentecost, though public games were suspended, and theatres closed by command of

[1] In the fifth century we see, though the days of Pentecost were observed, business was not interrupted; nor could all these days have been kept, as Sundays were, from the time Ascension day was distinguished from the rest as one of the high festivals. Indeed, to put a stop to all labour and business for seven continuous weeks, seems so impracticable, that I cannot but think Tertullian's account of Pentecost, in his Treatise on Prayer, is to be understood only, or chiefly, of the prohibition at that time to kneel or to fast; and that, in his Treatise on Idolatry, he rather recommends the holy season as a fit season for bodily recreation, than gives an historical account of the general practice of the labouring classes, at least, in his age. Certainly, what is continually dwelt upon, both by him and other early writers, is, that they never saddened this season by fasting and humiliation, but kept it, by their very posture in prayer, as a joyous commemoration of the resurrection.

the Emperor Theodosius the younger, law proceedings and other business were not interrupted [1].

In the ninth century, however, more of these other holy days are classed with the Lord's day. The Council at Mentz in 813, determine, that in the infirmity or absence of the Bishop, some one should be provided on the Lord's day, and other holy days, to preach the Word of God, so that the people might understand it: and, forty-five years afterwards, Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, after reckoning up, as the greater festivals, the week before Easter, the week after Christmas, the feasts of the Apostles and the Lord's day, adds, that on these neither public shows are exhibited, nor are the courts of justice open. After three centuries more, a considerable alteration appears to have taken place, not only in the number of days consecrated as Sabbaths, but in the character of the occasions thought sufficient for consecrating them. In 1174, Manuel Comnenus, the emperor, issued his decree, that the following days be exempt from labour, viz. the nativity of the Virgin Mary, Holy Cross day, (the other days then kept being enumerated), with every Sunday in the year; and that on them there be no access to the seats of judgment. But while the number of Sabbath days was thus increasing in the Church, we find Bernard, the celebrated abbot of Clairval, grounds the observance of them all on the fourth commandment. And truly, if the institution of

[1] See Bingham's Antiq. of the Christian Church, B. XX.

the Lord's day rest only on human authority, as that of other holy days, it may soon be made to appear, that all alike are to be observed, as all alike standing in the place of the weekly and other Sabbaths of the Jews, by the appointment of the Church. Now the great argument with the Roman Catholics, for the power of the Church, was, that she had substituted the Lord's day for the Sabbath day, and had transferred to it all the honour of the other, so setting aside the letter of God's own command: and thus it came to pass, that with them, both the Lord's day and other festivals also, were at length accounted holy, not merely in relation to the holy services performed on them, but "in themselves truly and properly invested with a greater sanctity than other days:" and it was laid down in the Canon, that to travel, or be engaged in any worldly business on any of these holy days, was a mortal sin; with exceptions, however, if the business were necessary, as that of butchers or bakers may be, or were slight, so as "not to interrupt the Sabbath's rest;" or, if it were done for a devout and pious purpose; as, for instance, a man might travel to a shrine on a holy day, but it was a mortal sin, if on that same day he presumed to return [1].

The evil of the great number of these holy days had been felt by Roman Catholics themselves. In 1362 [2], Simon Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury, charged his clergy to teach their parishioners "not

[1] See Heylyn's Hist. of Sabbath, Part II. ch. 5, 6.

[2] Fox's Acts and Monuments, K. Edw. III.

to abstain from bodily labour on certain Saints' days, which before were wont to be consecrated to unthrifty idleness." Yet the Popes, unconscious or unmindful of the evil, seem to have continued to canonize whom they would, without much regard to their characters, if they had been benefactors to the Romish establishment; so that Fox, the Martyrologist[1], was provoked to complain, in rather unceremonious language, that they had "cumbered the year with so many idle holy days, and the calendar with so many rascal saints, some of them as good as ever were they that put Christ to death."

And he has recorded the following instance of the rigour with which the Papists insisted on the observance of their holy days[2]. In the year 1549, a tailor of Paris, living in the street St. Antoine, near the Place Royale, was unfortunately detected following his occupation on one of these festivals. The officer, who arrested him, demanding why he was at work instead of observing the holy day, he answered, with honest simplicity, that he was a poor man, living only on his labour; and, as to the day, that he knew no other than Sunday alone, on which he might not lawfully work for the necessity of his living. For this heresy the poor tailor was clapped into prison; whence, as might be expected, he found no deliverance but to the flames.

Such was the Popish doctrine concerning their holy

[1] Fox's Acts and Mon. Defence of Lord Cobham against Alan Cope, K. Hen. V.

[2] Ibid., Table of French Martyrs, K. Hen. VIII.

days, when the Reformation began on the Continent: and it ought not to excite our surprise, if, in the first stir and heat of that great convulsion in the affairs of religion, some things should have been said otherwise than would be afterwards approved, and that, in rooting up the tares, some momentary harm might have been done to the wheat also.

None, perhaps, of the ancient Confessions of these Churches has a higher claim on our respect, than that drawn up by Melancthon, at the Diet of Augsburg. In this confession, to the question, what we ought to think of the Lord's day, it is answered, that the Lord's day, Easter, Whitsuntide, and other such holy days, ought to be kept because they are appointed by the Church, that all things may be done in order; but that the observance of them is not to be thought necessary to salvation, nor the violation of them, if it be done without offence to others, to be regarded as a sin [1]. "For they who think the observance of the Lord's day has been appointed by the authority of the Church instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err. The Scripture allows that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath; for it teaches, that the ceremonies of the law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when to assemble together, it appears that the Church appointed, for this purpose, the Lord's day,

[1] Confess. August. De Potest. Eccles. Sylloge Confess. Oxford, 1804, p. 193.

which, for this reason also, seems to have pleased the more, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary." With all the respect we feel for Melancthon, there is something here which cannot be altogether approved. His immediate design, indeed, was to refute the Romanists, who had maintained, (as has been before observed), that the unlimited power of the Church was proved, by her changing the Sabbath into the Lord's day, and so setting aside the fourth commandment. The obvious way to answer this, is to shew, how the first day of the week had been preferred in honour above the seventh, by God himself, and thence had been adopted as the holy day of the Lord by the Church, under the direction of the inspired Apostles. But, though such an answer, distinguishing between the power of the Apostles and that of their successors, would have thrown down the argument, on which the notion of the unlimited power of the Church had been made to rest, it would not have met the question in all its bearings. Melancthon was contending against this power chiefly on account of the mischievous doctrines grounded upon it—the pretence, that to keep the holy days appointed by the Church, is as necessary to the Christian as to keep the Sabbaths had been to the Israelites of old. To them to keep the Sabbaths was among those things of the law, to do which should be their righteousness: and so the Romanists attempted to represent the observance of fasts and festivals, and canonical hours, as among the means whereby we are

to be justified. This attempt Melancthon felt bound to resist, as it subverts the very foundation itself, justification, freely given, through the merits of Christ. He denies, then, that the observance of the Lord's day is necessary to justification or salvation, as the means whereby this blessing is to be obtained: but he does not deny that it is generally necessary to sustain the sentiments and habits of devotional piety, without which we have but the name of Christians. He has asserted, indeed, only the necessity of appointing a day, on which people may assemble together. It would have been better, if he had asserted also the general necessity of assembling together on the appointed day. He seems not to have allowed its due importance to a regular observance of the Lord's day, from a fear lest he should, in any degree, foster those Jewish notions of it, which the Church of Rome, from the age of Thomas Aquinas, had adopted. Sunday is not substituted for the Jewish Sabbath, so that whoever keeps it not, that soul shall be cut off from his people; but it is substituted, as the day set apart for the more especial worship of the Almighty.

The Confession of Augsburg, however, it should be remembered, was written at a very early period of the Reformation, in the year 1530: and, certainly, the Confession of Saxony, drawn up at the instance of Maurice, by the same writer, to be laid before the Council of Trent, in 1551, holds a somewhat different language on this subject. After a similar protest against the doctrine, that fasts and other ritual worship appointed by the Church can merit the remission

of sins, it acknowledges, with thanksgiving[1], that God, "from the beginning of the human race, has preserved the public ministry of his Word, and the decent and orderly assemblings of his people, and has himself marked out certain times." Now these words, it must be allowed, convey the true doctrine of the Christian Sabbath, provided only (to borrow an expression[2] of the deputies who subscribed for the Margrave of Brandenburg) they be "dexterously understood." This Confession, then, may be regarded as a commentary on that of Augsburg, which, however, must not be supposed to have been laid aside by the Churches of Saxony, since we know it was afterwards presented by them to Ferdinand, when he received the imperial crown on Charles's resignation.

The other great branch of the Reformed Churches on the Continent, had not to record its sentiments on this subject at so early a period. The very brief Confession of Basle, in 1532, only disapproves generally all distinction of days, and the dedication of holy days to saints; and the scarcely enlarged one, drawn up four years afterwards, contains nothing bearing on this question, but a direction that the people should daily assemble in the public and consecrated places, to hear the Word of God. The more elaborate work, properly called the Helvetic Confession, was not written till the year 1566: and it is to this we must turn, to find the opinions of these Churches on the observance of the Lord's day.

[1] Confess. Saxon. De Traditione. Sylloge Confess. p. 268.
[2] Ibid. p. 284.

After censuring the Popish notions of canonical hours, it thus proceeds[1]: "Since religion, though it is not restricted to any time, yet cannot be either established or practised, unless certain times be set apart and appointed, every Church chooses for itself a certain time for public prayers, for preaching the Gospel, and for celebrating the sacraments. Nor is it lawful for any individual, of his own fancy, to disturb this ordinance of the Church. And unless a reasonable cessation from business be granted, for the practice of external religion, certainly people will be withdrawn from it by their employments. Whence we see, that, in the ancient Churches, not only *certain hours* were appointed in every week for religious assemblies, but that *even the day*, called the Lord's day, was consecrated to these assemblies, and to a holy rest, from the very age of the Apostles: a rule which is properly observed by our Churches to the present time, for the purpose of worship and charity. We allow here no room for a Judaical observance and superstition: for we do not believe that one day is more holy than another, nor do we think that rest from labour is of itself acceptable to God; but we celebrate the Lord's day, not the Sabbath, observing it as men set free from the law. Moreover, if any Churches, according to their Christian liberty, religiously keep the commemoration of the nativity, the circumcision, the passion, the resurrection, and the ascension of our Lord, and also of the descent of the Holy Spirit on his disciples,

[1] Confess. Helvet. c. 24, De Feriis, &c. Sylloge Confess. p. 92.

—this we altogether approve; but we disapprove festivals in honour of men or saints. For festivals truly belong to the first table of the law, and are in honour of God alone."

The censure on the canonical hours, which immediately precedes this extract, seems to throw some light upon it, to shew in what sense it is declared, that each Church chooses a certain time for public worship, and to reconcile that declaration with the acknowledgment of the Apostolical appointment of the Lord's day. The Belgic Confession, written five years earlier, states nothing distinctly on this matter; but the Catechism of Heidelberg, which became[1] generally adopted by the Calvinist Churches, teaches us[2], that, in the fourth commandment, God commands two things—first, that we attend divine service every day, especially on holy days—secondly, that all the days of our life we cease from works of sin, that the Holy Spirit may work his work in us, and so, even here, we may begin an eternal Sabbath. Similar to this is the language of Calvin's own Catechism. It should be observed, however, that the holy days here mentioned, as appears from the Helvetic Confession, are, besides the Sundays, those only in honour of Christ and of the Holy Spirit: "they all belong to the first table of the Law, and are in honour of God alone."

To these extracts from public documents of the Calvinist Churches, it may be well to add the following,

[1] Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. London, 1811. Vol. IV p. 367

[2] Sylloge Confess p. 354.

from the writings of Calvin himself, of Beza, of Peter Martyr, and of Bernardine Ochin. "It is to be desired," says Calvin, in one[1] of his Epistles, "that but few holy days, besides the Lord's day, should be retained;" and, in his Institutions, speaking of the fourth commandment, he observes[2], that the ancient Fathers commonly call it a shadow, as it enjoins the outward observance of a day, which, with all other figures, was abolished by the coming of Christ; and he adds, that this indeed is true, but that they had touched only half of the question; and he gives his three reasons for keeping a Christian Sabbath; which will be seen in our examination of his Catechism, together with that of Dr. Nowell. Many, it seems, had complained of the Lord's day, as if it were Judaism to observe days. "We observe them not," proceeds Calvin, "with superstition, as a ceremony, which we believe to be a figure of spiritual mysteries; but we adopt them as the necessary means of preserving order in the Church. The Jews abstained from manual labour, not because it was an hindrance to their sacred service and meditations, but superstitiously, because they imagined that by rest they kept a remembrance of mysteries, which in the old time were esteemed."—"The ancient Fathers substituted the Lord's day in the room of the Sabbath, with good reason; for it was the day of Christ's resurrection, and put an end to all the shadows of the Law; and Christians were admonished by this

[1] Calv. Epist. p. 450. Genevæ, 1617.

[2] Instit. L. II. c. 8.

change of the day, not to cling to ceremonial shadows. Nevertheless, I do not so insist on the number seven, as to bring the Church into bondage to that number; neither will I condemn Churches which appoint other festivals for their religious assemblies, provided only there be no superstition." On the fourth commandment, Beza says[1], "Every Christian ought to know, that so far as it was ceremonial, it hath an end; not that, in lieu of the seventh day, called the Sabbath, we should Judaize the Sunday, (for this were not to impose an end unto the figures by the real coming of the truth, Col. ii. 16, but only to change the day), but to the end that, according unto *the ordinance of the Apostles*, (which may be gathered evidently from 1 Cor. xvi. 2, and Rev. i.) as the memory of the creation of the world in six days was celebrated in the sanctification of the seventh day, (and that notwithstanding, in the deliverance from Egypt, the order of the months and the beginning of the year were changed), so, by the new creation of the second world, (which the Prophets call a new heaven and a new earth, Isa. lxi. 17; lxvi. 22), appearing in the resurrection of the Lord, the true Light of this world, ought to be renewed and celebrated the day which we call Sunday, that is to say, the Lord's day, after a special fashion, and such a one as distinguisheth this day from other in respect of the principal use: as in the time of the Apostles themselves this day was celebrated by a more special assembly of the faithful. But that the Christians should

[1] Beza on the Song of Solomon, eighth Sermon on ch. 3

otherwise abstain from their work, without it were for that time which was requisite for their assembly, this was never commanded nor observed, until that Christian Emperors made an ordinance for it; indeed, most commendable, to the end we should not be otherwise distracted, to give ourselves over the more to all holy things. But what? All this is now become with them [the Roman Catholics] a very Judaism, in such sort that, to open a shop-window, or to give one blow with the hammer, is such a sin, as should raise a whole city in a commotion: but not, to game, to go to the tavern, to play the whoremaster. For this is now grown into a custom. And as if the exercise of a Christian were, under a colour of devotion, to do nothing, they could not content themselves with two and fifty Sundays, but they must have so many holydays added, that almost the third part of the year is passed away in such idle festivals." Peter Martyr, on the second chapter of Genesis, observes, "that people rest from labour one day of the week to serve God, is not a mere device of man's brain, neither did it only appertain to man's law, but it had beginning from hence. Now if you demand why this seventh day is not still retained in the Church, our answer is, that we are to have all days such that we may rest in them from our own works: but that one day be chosen rather than another, for God's external worship, the Church had liberty from Christ to establish that which it judged most convenient." To these remarks of Peter Martyr, I would add the following from the Sermons of his friend, Bernardine

Ochin[1]. "If thou wouldest ask, at what time God ought to be loved, they [the Roman Catholics] will answer, on the Sabbath and festival days."——"It is sufficient, therefore, to a Christian, according to their divinity, that, for to observe the chiefest commandment of the law and of the love of God, only the Sundays and holydays have towards God an act of love, with exalting him above all other things, albeit it were but for a small moment of time. Thus, they say, that their most holy Church hath decreed." To which Ochin answers, that "we are bound to love God always and continually with all our heart. We ought also to sanctify him with making him shine in honour of his Majesty, not only on the Sundays and holydays, but all the time of our life, and every moment thereof; forasmuch as to this end only it is granted us from God." And again, "The Papists, being desirous to hold against the truth, that men may be justified and saved through their own works, and, by observing the commandments of God, and seeing that there is none that loveth God continually and with all his heart, they have no other course, than depraving and expressly gainsaying the holy Scriptures, to persuade men, that for observing the first and chiefest commandment of the Law, it is sufficient that, at the least the twinkling of an eye, upon the Sabbath day, we have in us some act of love towards God, with exalting him above all

[1] Ochin's Sermons, translated from the Italian by W. Phiston. London, 1580, p. 85, 86, fifth Serm. of Charity.

things; and that this, through our most and mighty free-will, is always in our power."

On reading the above extracts from the works of these distinguished Reformers, we see that they were contending, not against keeping a Christian Sabbath, but against Sabbatism, against the Judaism on this subject which had infected the Church of Rome: and it is no more than might be expected, if, in the heat of the contention, they should be found both themselves to have erred in some degree in the opposite direction, and have coloured perhaps too highly the Romish errors. Certainly, Beza's censure of the prohibition to open shop-windows on an holyday, leaves out of sight the breach of the day's duty to which that opened shop-window would in all probability lead; and his assertion that Christians never abstained from their work on the Lord's day, except so far as was requisite for their religious assembly, before it was commanded by Christian Emperors, does not well consist with the constant language of the Fathers, that the day was a festival, even if Tertullian had not expressly declared, that on it they put off business. And though, when I look to his Catechism, I cannot but regard Calvin's declaration against the necessity of keeping a seventh day, as a concession to the declared opinions of his Lutheran brethren, I feel a pleasure in recognizing a more correct statement of the truth in the writings of Peter Martyr.

And the statement of this distinguished foreigner, who from the Calvinist Church filled the divinity chair at Oxford, it is acceptable to confirm by that of the not less distinguished foreigner from the Lutheran

Church, who was called at the same time to the same chair in the sister University. "Although," says Bucer[1], "we are no longer under Moses as our schoolmaster, nor are so held by religion to the Sabbaths and other feasts he appointed for the people of old, as to be bound to keep them on the same day, month, and time, yet it is our duty to sanctify one day in each week for the public service of religion: that there be one day in the week on which the people may have nothing else to do than to go to Church, there to hear God's Word, to pour out their prayers, to confess their faith, to give thanks, to make oblations, and to receive the holy communion. These are the works of holy festivals: hence the Lord's day was consecrated to these by the very Apostles."

After this survey of the progress of opinion on the Lord's day among the members of the Reformed Churches on the Continent, it will not excite surprise, that in our own country also, in the very same year in which the Confession of Augsburg was written, Tyndal, who had resided much in Germany, should have maintained[2], that "as for the Sabbath, we be lords over the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday, or into any other day, as we see need, or may make every tenth day holyday only, if we see cause why. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, but to put a difference between us and the Jews; neither need we any holyday at all, if

[1] Bucer de Regno Christi. L. I. c. 11. See also L. II. c. 10.
[2] Tyndal's Answer to Sir Thomas More.

the people might be taught without it:" or that, three years afterwards, in the year of his death, Frith should have declared[1], that "our forefathers, which were in the beginning of the Church, did abrogate the Sabbath, to the intent that men might have an ensample of Christian liberty. Howbeit, because it was necessary that a day should be reserved, in which the people should come together to hear the Word of God, they ordained, instead of the Sabbath, which was Saturday, the next day following, which is Sunday. And although they might have kept Saturday with the Jews as a thing indifferent, yet they did much better." These excellent men, (cut off before the Reformation had made much progress in England, Frith in 1533, Tyndal three years afterwards), wrote at the time when the evil of the number of the Romish holydays, and the superstitious observance of them by the people, was so strongly felt, as to call for a check even from those, who had not then embraced the opinions of the Reformers: in 1536, Henry the Eighth issued his injunctions to the Bishops to lessen the number of holydays. Yet we should notice, that they both speak of Sunday, as made the day of public religious instruction, instead of the ancient Sabbath: and though Tyndal somewhat extravagantly considers the change of any other day for it still in the power of the Church, his friend Frith represents the change as having been made by the Apostles; for St. Paul certainly was among those forefathers in the beginning, who abro-

[1] Frith's Treatise on Baptism.

gated the Jewish Sabbath. To the above extracts from their writings, Dr. Heylyn is pleased to add one from Bishop Hooper's work on the Decalogue; and on the joint authority of these three to conclude, that the Lord's day has no institution from divine authority, that the Church has still the power to change the day from Sunday to any other she will, and that one day in seven is not the moral part of the fourth commandment. Now as this work of Hooper was written in the year 1550, when the subject had been more considered by the Reformers, in the year too when he was made Bishop of Gloucester; and therefore his opinion may be supposed truly to represent that of the Church; it is important to see how far his authority supports Dr. Heylyn's conclusions, which evidently rest on that of Tyndal alone. The following is Heylyn's extract from Hooper's Commentary on the fourth Commandment: "Ye may not think that God gave any more holiness to the Sabbath than to the other days; for if ye consider Friday, Saturday, or Sunday, inasmuch as they be days, and the work of God, the one is no more holy than the other; but that the day is always most holy, in the which we most apply and give ourselves unto holy works. To that end he sanctifieth the Sabbath day; not that we should give ourselves to evil, or such ethnical pastime, as is now used amongst Christian people; but, being free on that day from the travails of this world, that we might consider the works and benefits of God with thanksgiving, hear the Word and law of God, honour him and fear him, and then learn, who and where be the poor of Christ, our

brethren in necessity, that want our help." It is clear, that what is here said of one day not being more holy than another, is equally applied to the Jewish as to the Christian Sabbath: but we will take another extract from this same Commentary, which it is strange indeed should have been omitted by any one, who honestly desired to give Bishop Hooper's opinion on the subject[1]. "Although the ceremony of the Sabbath be taken away, which appertained only unto the people and commonwealth of the Hebrews; yet one day of the week, to preserve and use the Word of God, is not abrogated. Therefore, in this commandment are two things to be observed—the one ceremonial, during for the time; the other moral, and never to be abolished, as long as the Church of Christ shall continue upon the earth. *The Patriarchs before the Law, the Prophets in the time of the Law, and we, being delivered from the damnation of the Law, have one day to rest from labour, and to apply ourselves to the work of the Spirit;* which secretly in ourselves should be done every day together with handy labour, but upon the *Sunday openly*, without the labour of our hands. This *Sunday*, that we observe, is *not the commandment of man*." I will only add, that Bishop Hooper says[2], "the Sabbath hitherto, from the beginning of the world, was and is a type of the eternal and everlasting rest that is to come."

[1] Fathers of the English Church. London, 1810. Vol. V. p. 339.

[2] Ibid. p. 336.

Perhaps, however, it may be thought that the doctrines of our Church ought to be sought in those maintained by Archbishop Cranmer. "The Institution of a Christian man," though signed by him and Bishop Latimer, yet signed also, among others, by Bishops Stokesly, Tonstall and Gardiner, and by Bonner and Heath, then Archdeacons, and drawn up in 1587, the very year before poor Lambert's martyrdom, cannot be regarded as altogether expressing the opinions of Protestants: yet, as it was one of the first advances towards the Reformation in this country, and on the particular subject before us strikes at the root of some of the errors, which in the last four centuries had sprung up in the Roman Church, the following extracts will be read with interest. "There is this special and notable difference between the fourth commandment, and the other nine. For[1], as Austin saith,

1 "Of all the ten commandments, that of the Sabbath alone is given to be kept as a figure; which figure we are to embrace with our understanding, not also to set forth by bodily rest. For, whereas, by the Sabbath is signified the spiritual rest, to which mankind are called by our Lord himself, saying, Come unto me, and I will give you rest; yet the other commandments we keep without any figurative signification, in their primary and proper sense, as they were delivered."—"But we are not commanded literally to observe the Sabbath day, by rest from bodily labour, as the Jews observe it; and this very observance of theirs, according to the commandment, is thought ridiculous, except it signifies another and a spiritual rest."—"The Lord's day, however, has been declared, not to the Jews, but to Christians, by the resurrection of our Lord, and from Him (or from that time, *ex illo*) began to be a fes-

'All the other nine be merely moral commandments, and belonged not only to the Jews, and all other people of the world in the time of the Old Testament, but also belong now to all Christian people in the New Testament. But this precept of the Sabbath, as concerning *rest from bodily labour* the seventh day, is ceremonial, and pertained only unto the Jews in the Old Testament, before the coming of Christ, and pertaineth not unto us Christian people in the New Testament. Nevertheless, as concerning *the spiritual rest* which is figured and signified by this corporal rest, that is to say, rest from the carnal works of the flesh, and all manner of sin, this precept is moral, and remaineth still, and bindeth them that belong unto Christ; and not for every seventh day only, but for all days, hours and times.' We must rest from our carnal wills, that God may work in us his will and pleasure."

Again, "we are bound *by this precept* at certain times, to cease from all bodily labour, and to give our minds entirely and wholly to God, to hear and learn his word, to acknowledge our own sinfulness unto God, and his great mercy and goodness to us, to give

tival."—Augustin. ad Inquis. Jan. L. II. Ep. 55. In the above passages, Austin has considered rest on the seventh day either as a figure, or as an end: it should rather be considered as a means for the due performance of public worship; that, being free from this world's affairs, we may devote ourselves wholly to religion. That the day be kept holy, is first and last in God's commandment; rest is subordinate: a point always to be borne in mind, that we may think aright on this subject. Austin, however, distinctly acknowledges the true origin of the Lord's day.

thanks for all his benefits, to make public and common prayer for all things needful, to receive the Sacraments, to visit the sick, to instruct every man his children and family in virtue and godliness, and such other like works; which things, although Christians be bound unto *by this commandment*, yet the Sabbath day, which is called Saturday, is not now prescribed and appointed thereto, as it was to the Jews; but instead of the Sabbath day succeedeth *the Sunday, and many other holy and feastful days, which the Church hath ordained from time to time;* which are called holy days, not because one day is more acceptable to God than another, but because *the Church hath ordained*, that on those days we give ourselves *wholly* to holy works *without impediment;* whereas, on other days, we work, and are thereby much letted from holy works." Then follows an instruction how we ought to behave both at Church and through the day; after which it is said, "If men would occupy themselves on the holy days and spend the same [1] *wholly* after this form and manner, not only in the house of God, but also in their own houses, they would eschew much vice, and obtain much grace." The bishops and clergy are then directed to teach the people not to be over-scrupulous and superstitious in abstaining from labour on the holy day; for that, *in time of necessity*, we rather offend, if from scrupulosity we save not what God has sent. And as to spending the day in idleness, gluttony, or other vain and idle pastime, it is declared, that "such

[1] Holily. Necess. Doct. et Erud.

keeping of the holy day is not the intent and meaning of this commandment, but after the usage and custom of the Jews, and doth not please God, but offend him. For, as Austin saith [1], it is better to work than to be idle;" and it is better for "women to bestow their time in spinning of wool, than on the Sabbath day to lose their time in leaping, dancing, and other idle, wanton, lose-time [2]." This work, with some alterations, was republished in 1540; and again, with the King's Preface, in 1543, under the title of "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man." But, with respect to the above extract, I see no important alterations, except that Sunday seems more distinctly marked as the successor of the ancient Sabbath: "instead of the Sabbath day succeedeth Sunday, in the

[1] August. Enarrat. in Ps. xci.

[2] If the accuracy of the representation before made, of the Popish doctrines concerning the Sabbatarian observance of their holy days, be called in question, because Roman Catholics signed this document; let it be remembered, that these Roman Catholics had acknowledged, as head of the English Church, the king, Henry VIII. who, the very year before, had issued his injunctions to lessen the number and the superstitious observance of these festivals, declaring, that if the Sabbath was ordained only for man's use, and was to give way to his necessity, much more should any holy day instituted by man. And that the Romish clergy afterwards used to speak of the abrogated holy days, so as to excite discontent among the people, or induce them to continue their accustomed idleness, is evident from the letter the king sent to Bonner but a few months before the close of his reign.—Fox's Acts and Mon. Hen. VIII. The King's Art. and Injunct. for Refor. of Church, p. 1067, and Abrog. of Holy Days, p. 1229.

memory of Christ's resurrection. And also many other holy and festival days, which the Church hath ordained from time to time," &c.: and that, on holy days in general, it is not required that the day be *wholly* spent in religious employments. And after the clause enjoining work on them in times of necessity, it is added, that " yet in such times (if their business be not very great and urgent) men ought to have regard to the holy day, that they do bestow some convenient time in hearing divine service."

Both these documents, then, speak of all holy days alike with Sunday as the Sabbath days, to be kept, according to the directions for keeping them, in obedience to the fourth commandment. And so in the Primer, or Book of Prayers, set forth in the last year of Henry VIII.'s reign, where the general confession, enumerating the violation of each of the commandments, on the fourth says, " I have not sanctified *the holy days* with works which be acceptable unto Thee, nor instructing my neighbour in virtue accordingly;" when we turn to the Decalogue, we find, in strict conformity with this notion, nothing more of the fourth commandment than these words only—" Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day." This lopping off all mention of the six days' creation, and of the hallowed rest on the seventh, in order to make the commandment square with the Romish doctrine, might have been a hint to Cranmer, that his opinions on this head were not yet those we are taught in the Ten Commandments of Almighty God.

That such, at this time, were Archbishop Cranmer's

own opinions, is evident, because, even two years afterwards, he published the Catechism, which commonly passes under his name, but which had been originally written in Germany, and translated into Latin by Justus Jonas, Principal of the University of Wittenberg, in 1639. This work, then, though as we look to the time when it appeared, it serves to illustrate the progress of opinion on this subject in the Lutheran Churches, cannot be expected so truly to state the doctrine of our own Church on the fourth commandment, as any original composition [1] of the same date by the Archbishop, or as the somewhat later commentary of Bishop Hooper. Still, as Cranmer adopted it, and published it in his own name, it must not be left out in an account of the proceedings in this country. In the explanation of the fourth commandment, we have the following passage: "We must sanctify the Sabbath day, that is to say, employ and bestow it upon godly and holy works and business. And here note, good children, that the Jews, in the Old Testament, were commanded to keep the Sabbath day, and they observed it every seventh day, called the Sabbath, or Saturday. But we, Christian men, in the New Testament, are not

[1] If, for instance, Cranmer had written this Catechism himself, he would not have chosen such an expression as this—"With our bodily mouth we receive the body and blood of Christ,"—though, when he saw it in this Catechism of Germany, he understood it in a figurative sense, as that of Tertullian, (De Resurr. Carn. c. 8.), "the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul also may be fattened of God:" nor would he have made absolution a third sacrament.

bound to such commandments of Moses' law concerning differences of times, days, and meats, but have liberty and freedom to use other days for our Sabbath days, therein to hear the Word of God and keep an holy rest. And, therefore, that this Christian liberty may be kept and maintained, we now keep no more the Sabbath, or Saturday, as the Jews do, but we observe the Sunday, and certain other days, as[1] the magistrates do judge it convenient, whom in this thing we ought to obey." Though here the number of holy days besides the Sundays, or else the manner of observing them, is made to depend on the magistrates, as the supremacy in the Church is given to the supreme civil rulers in all Lutheran states as well as in our own, it must be understood, that these points being once settled, the Catechism represents the observance of the Sabbaths, as a duty, not to any earthly magistrate, but to the Lord Almighty, who bids us "bestow all such days about holy, heavenly, and godly things."—"Though every man hath need to labour daily for his daily food, yet God hath given us Sabbath days, or resting times; and yet, on those days he feedeth us as well as on the working days." By Sabbath days here are evidently meant, as in the preceding documents, not Sundays only, but all other holy days also; and the number of these, we know, is different in different Protestant Churches.

In close conformity with the first of the above ex-

[1] Secundum quod magistratui, pastoribus Ecclesiarum, honestum et utile videtur.—Jonas's Latin Translation.

tracts from this "Catechism of Germany," as Cranmer himself called it, in his "Answer to a crafty Cavillation" of Gardiner, yet seeming to claim something more of power for the magistrates, is a document, which Heylyn considers of vast importance in ascertaining the sentiments of the Church of England on the Lord's day; and this document is the preamble to the Act of Parliament, by which the Book of Common Prayer was confirmed in 1551. From this he gives the following extracts: "Forasmuch as men be not at all times so mindful to laud and praise God, so ready to resort to hear God's holy Word, and to come to the holy Communion, &c. as their bounden duty doth require: therefore, to call men to remembrance of their duty, and to help their infirmity, it hath been wholesomely provided, that there should be some certain times and days appointed, wherein the Christians should cease from all kind of labour, and apply themselves only and wholly unto the aforesaid holy works, properly pertaining unto true religion, &c. which works, as they may well be called God's service, so the times especially appointed for the same, are called holy days: not for the matter or the nature, either of the time or day, &c. for so all days and times are of like holiness; but for the nature and condition of such holy works, &c. whereunto such times and days are sanctified and hallowed: that is to say, separated from all prophane uses, and dedicated, not unto any saint or creature, but only unto God and his true worship. Neither is it to be thought, that there is any certain time, or definite number of days, prescribed in holy

Scripture; but the appointment, both of the time and also of the number of days, is left, by the authority of God's Word, unto the liberty of Christ's Church, to be determined and assigned orderly in every country, by the discretion of the rulers and ministers thereof, as they shall judge most expedient, to the true setting forth of God's glory, and the edification of their people." It is then enacted, that "all Sundays in the year," and the feasts now kept in our Church, which are distinctly enumerated, "be kept, and commanded to be kept, holy days, and that none other day shall be kept, and commanded to be kept, holy day; and to abstain from all lawful bodily labour:" and there is a further clause providing, that it shall be lawful, "upon the holy days aforesaid, in harvest, or at any other times in the year, when necessity shall so require, to work any kind of work, any thing in this act unto the contrary notwithstanding."

A provision, similar to this last clause, appears also in the injunction issued by Queen Elizabeth, in the first year of her reign. After declaring her will and pleasure that "all her subjects shall celebrate and keep their holy day, according to God's holy will and pleasure; that is, in hearing the Word of God read and taught, in private and public prayers; in acknowledging their offences unto God, and amendment of the same; in reconciling themselves charitably to their neighbours where displeasure hath been; in oftentimes receiving the communion of the body and blood of Christ; in visiting the poor and sick, using all soberness and godly conversation," her Majesty en-

joins that, "yet, notwithstanding, all parsons, vicars, and curates, shall teach and declare to their parishioners, that they may, with a safe and quiet conscience, *after their Common Prayer, in the time of harvest,* labour upon the holy and festival days, and save that thing which God hath sent." We should, however, notice here, that the Act of Parliament only declares, that the law of the land does not interfere to prevent labour on holy days in times of *necessity,* and that, though the Queen in such cases enjoins labour on the holy and festival days, it is only *after the public service of the day is done:* and as men's scruples on the subject might be expected to lie chiefly against working on a Sunday, it is not a little remarkable, that neither the act nor the injunctions specify these days, although the common description, as it appears in our Prayer-Book, was "Sundays and other holy days." And we must not suppose, from the language of this Act, that the Church thought herself at liberty not to include Sunday among her holy days. The Lord's day, so named in Scripture, has always been accounted an holy day in all Christian Churches. It is the number of other holy days, which, in the Scriptures, is left undefined.

But the use Dr. Heylyn makes of this Act of Parliament, is most extraordinary. The commandments were now first added to the liturgy; and the commandment, "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day," immediately followed by the prayer, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law," would have staggered most persons, who had

been disposed to deny, that Sunday, at least, is to be kept holy as the Christian Sabbath. But not Dr. Heylyn. According to him, the Liturgy, the most deliberate judgment of the ablest divines [1] Protestantism could produce, is to be interpreted by an Act of Parliament, passed in the fifth year of the Reformation of the English Church, in a mixed assembly! The liturgy, designed for constant use, and in the hands of all, is to be interpreted by an Act of Parliament, I had almost said, in the hands of none! To allow this notion, would be to justify the Papistical taunt, that ours is a Parliament [2] religion. The true meaning of this part of our Liturgy it is better to seek in the Catechism, commonly called King Edward's, written by Poynet, Bishop of Winchester, the year preceding the passing of this Act, and sanctioned by the King's injunction the year following. The abstract of the first table of the commandments closes in these words, "Last of all, this ought we to hold steadfastly and with devout conscience, that we keep holily and religiously *the Sabbath day*, which *was appointed out* from the other for the rest and service of God:" and afterwards to the question, "What hast thou to say of the Sabbath or the holy day, which even now thou madest mention of among the laws of the first table?" the answer is, "Sabbath is as much to say as rest. It

[1] The opinions of Peter Martyr and Bucer, who were employed in this revision of the Liturgy, have already been given.

[2] Harding's Confut. of Apology, Part VI. c. 2. See Oxford Reasons against the Covenant. Walton's Lives, Vol. II. p. 299. Oxford. 1805.

was appointed for only honour and service of God; and it is a figure of that rest and quietness, which they have that believe in Christ."—"And meet it is, that faithful Christians, on such days as are appointed out for holy things, should lay aside unholy works, and give themselves earnestly to religion and serving of God." To keep Sunday holy is unquestionably here represented as required by the fourth commandment: perhaps to keep other holy days also.

But if there be yet any doubt concerning the opinion of our Church on the Lord's day, it must be removed by the extract from the Homily on "The place and time of Prayer," which is brought forward indeed by Dr. Heylyn, though strong prejudice blinded him to its clear statements. "As concerning the time which Almighty God hath appointed his people to assemble together solemnly, it doth appear by the fourth commandment; "Remember," saith God, "that thou keep holy the Sabbath day." Upon the which day, as is plain in the Acts of the Apostles, the people accustomably resorted together, and heard diligently the Law and the Prophets read among them. And albeit, this commandment of God doth not bind Christian people so straitly to observe and keep *the utter ceremonies* of the Sabbath day, as it was given unto the Jews, as touching the *forbearing of work and labour in time of great necessity*, and as touching the precise keeping of *the seventh* day, after the manner of the Jews; for we keep now the first day, which is our Sunday, and make that our Sabbath, that is, our day of rest, in the honour of our Saviour Christ, who, as upon that day, rose

from death, conquering the same most triumphantly; yet, notwithstanding, whatsoever is found in the commandment *appertaining to the law of nature*, as a thing most godly, most just, and needful, for the setting forth of God's glory, it ought to be retained and kept of all good Christian people. And *therefore, by this commandment* we ought to have a time, as *one day in the week*, wherein we ought to rest, yea from our lawful and needful works. *For like as it appeareth by this commandment*, that no man *in the six days* ought to be slothful and idle, but diligently to labour in that state wherein God hath set him; even so *God hath given express charge to all men*, that upon *the Sabbath day, which is now our Sunday*, they should cease from all weekly and work-day labour, to the intent that like as God himself wrought six days, and rested the seventh, and blessed and sanctified it, and consecrated it to quietness and rest from labour; even so, God's obedient people should use the Sunday holily, and rest from their common and daily business, and also give themselves wholly to heavenly exercises of God's true religion and service. So that *God doth not only command the observation of this holy day*, but also, by his own example, doth stir and provoke us to the diligent keeping of the same. Good natural children, will not only become obedient to the commandment of their parents, but also have a diligent eye to their doings, and gladly follow the same. So if we will be the children of our heavenly Father, we must be careful to keep *the Christian Sabbath day, which is the Sunday*, not only for that it is *God's*

express commandment, but also to declare ourselves to be loving children, in following *the example* of our gracious Lord and Father.

"Thus it may plainly appear, that *God's will and commandment* was to have *a solemn time and standing day in the week*, wherein the people should come together, and have in remembrance his wonderful benefits, and to render him thanks, as appertaineth to loving, kind, and obedient people. This *example and commandment of God*, the godly Christian people began to follow *immediately after the ascension of our Lord Christ*, and began to choose them a standing day of the week to come together in; yet not the seventh day, which the Jews kept; but the Lord's day, the day of the Lord's resurrection, the day after the seventh day, which is the first day of the week. Of the which day, mention is made by St. Paul on this wise; 'In the first day of the Sabbath, let every man lay up what he thinketh good;' meaning for the poor: by the first of the Sabbath is meant our Sunday, which is the first day after the Jews' seventh day. And in the Apocalypse it is more plain, whereas St. John saith, 'I was in the Spirit upon the Lord's day.' Sithence which time, God's people hath always, in all ages, without any gainsaying, used to come together upon the Sunday, to celebrate and honour the Lord's blessed name, and carefully to keep that day in holy rest and quietness, both man, woman, child, servant, and stranger."

Such is the authoritative declaration of our Church on the duty of observing the Lord's day, and on the

grounds on which that duty rests: language so clear and plain, it might be thought, no sophistry could elude. We will consider what weight is due to Dr. Heylyn's remarks upon it. First, he says, it is declared we are bound to keep no more of the fourth commandment than belongs to the law of nature, and therefore, as he thinks all writers allow, that to keep one day in seven is ceremonial only, he thinks we are only bound by that commandment to keep a time, *as* one day in seven; a rule, as he alleges, not peremptory, but arbitrary. Now, not to repeat here my argument on this subject, I only observe, that it is not true that all writers allow his assertion, unless such writers as Hooper and Hooker, are to be set aside; and that the Homily itself distinctly says, God's will and commandment was, to have a standing day in the week: and if any think the word "was" here refers only to the times before the Gospel, I must request them to read the whole extract again. Secondly, he says, since the godly Christian people, immediately after the Ascension, chose the Lord's day, its observance was not enjoined by the Apostles: this needs no comment, it being quite clear forsooth, that the Apostles could not have been among the number of these godly Christian people, nor their guides in the choice; nor, the choice being made and the reason of it declared, could they have enjoined the weekly observance of the day! Here, however, we may note that the expression of the Homily, "immediately after the ascension," seems quite correct; for it is not to be supposed that, after the day when Thomas was present at Christ's

appearing, they would continue to commemorate his resurrection, while he yet was with them. Thirdly, Heylyn has recourse, (as I before intimated) to the notion of supererogation, which he seems to have picked up from the Council of Macon. The Christians, he says, *chose* themselves a standing day in the week, therefore "they did not this by any obligation laid upon them by the fourth commandment, but only by a voluntary following of God's example, and the analogy or equity of God's commandment, which was (they do not say, which is,) that he would have (amongst the Jews) a solemn time and standing day in the week." The only answer to this shall be in the words of the Homily itself. "God hath given express charge to all men, that upon the Sabbath day, which is now our Sunday, they should cease from all weekly and work-day labour;" and again, "we must be careful to keep the Christian Sabbath day, which is the Sunday, for it is God's express commandment." Fourthly, he says, the Church could not have considered the keeping of one day in seven to be the moral part of the fourth commandment, because they did not think that on our seventh day, we are obliged to forbear work and labour in time of great necessity, which the letter of that commandment seems to require. To say this, is as much as to say, we do not think ourselves bound by this commandment at all, because we accept that relaxation of it, which has been pointed out to us by God's own Son.

After more trifling to this effect, Dr. Heylyn has the effrontery to state, that "upon due search made, and

full examination of all parties, we find no Lord's day Sabbath in the book of Homilies; no, nor in any writings of particular men, in more than thirty-three years after the Homilies were published;" the second book of which, as is well known, appeared in 1560. After the close of the above-mentioned period, in the year 1595, he tells us, Dr. Bound first published his Sabbath doctrines; and certainly the extravagant height to which he and his followers carried their sabbatarian notions deserved and required the check they received: but only two years afterwards appeared another work of a very different mind, the fifth book of the Venerable Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity; a book, which, if Dr. Heylyn had consulted it, might have enabled him to form a better judgment on the whole subject of his enquiry, and particularly have taught him the difference of ground on which the duty of keeping the Lord's day stands from that of keeping other holy days, and the importance of the alteration, when, in the Convocation of 1603, part of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions was adopted as the thirteenth of the Ecclesiastical Canons, it was enjoined that all persons "shall celebrate and keep (not their holy day, as the queen had expressed it, but) the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, and other holy days." But within his fixed period of thirty-three years, nay, just ten years from the publication of the second book of the Homilies, Dr. Nowell published his celebrated Catechism, which, as it was dedicated to the archbishops and bishops of the realm, and approved by a synod of the clergy, ought to have attracted the notice

of Dr. Heylyn. The basis of this Catechism is that of Calvin, which was in general use with the English clergy, when they fled to Geneva from the persecution of Mary: and though, on the subjects of faith, prayer, and the sacraments, there are very considerable and important alterations and additions in Nowell's work, on the other of the four branches of necessary Christian instruction, obedience—the difference, as might be expected, is less, Nowell continually presenting us with the same sentiments, though not always in the same order, and often with the very same words, as Calvin; so that, in considering what is said on the fourth commandment, we consider not only the doctrine of our own Church, but that of the Calvinist Churches also. Both these Catechisms then state, that besides the mere outward bodily rest, which, being ceremonial, belongs to the Jews only, there are three things intended in the fourth commandment, which belong to us also: to maintain a certain order in the Church, to provide for the refreshing of servants, and to represent, by a figure, our spiritual rest. The spiritual rest is, that we rest from worldly business and our own works, bridle our sinful desires, and, having a certain holy vacation, yield ourselves wholly to God's governance, that he may do his works in us. And though this is our daily, continual duty, it is represented to us by a figure every seventh day. The reason assigned for appointing every seventh day, (besides the fanciful one, that the number seven in the Scripture signifies perfection, and so reminds us of our perfect duty), is, that after *the example* of God, who rested on the

seventh day, we also, every seventh day, must lay aside our worldly business, that we may more diligently meditate on his works, and attend to religion and godliness. And this is the order in the Church—that we assemble together to hear the doctrine of Christ, to yield confession of our faith, to make, openly, public prayers to God; to celebrate and retain the memory of God's works and benefits; and to use the mysteries that he hath left us. Then comes the question, "Shall it be enough to have done these things *every seventh day?*" and the answer is, "These things, indeed, every man privately ought to record and think upon every day: but, for our negligence and weakness' sake, one stated day is appointed to the public for the especial discharge of this duty." The joining of servants in this our service to the common Master of us all, is their refreshing and relief; which, it is observed, by making them more diligent to work on the other six days, is beneficial to those who employ them, and so to the commonwealth. So far both these Catechisms: Calvin's adds, that besides the benefit of the figure, as above described, "it leads us to the truth of this thing, whereof the Sabbath day is a figure: Nowell's, immediately after reciting the commandment, to the question, "What meaneth this word Sabbath?" gives answer, "Sabbath, by interpretation, signifies rest. That day, since it is appointed only for the worshipping of God, the godly must lay aside all worldly business:"—and, in the introductory part, says, that the custom of assembling together to hear the Word of God openly read and expounded every Sabbath day,

is "received in our Churches by the ordinance of the Apostles, and so of God himself."

It may be said, however, that such a Sabbath as is here described, is not precisely that of which Heylyn was speaking; and it may be so: he seems to think Sunday cannot be called a Sabbath, except it be kept in all the strictness of Judaical superstition; nay, the very name of Sabbath, as applied to Sunday, seems never to enter his mind, but Dr. Bound, and all the fanatic company of Sabbatarian preachers, rise up before him, and scare away his judgment. And by all accounts it appears, that their puritanical followers in Heylyn's time were much injuring the cause of sound religion, and spreading a sad and dismal gloom throughout the land. But whether the attempt to stop the growing mischief by a republication of King James's Book of Sports, was the most judicious course to adopt, is another question. It has already been observed, that the Injunctions to labour after service on holy days, in time of necessity, *perhaps* were meant to apply, not to Sundays, but to other festivals only: and if this were so, since these holy days are confessedly of human institution, human authority, no doubt, might dispense with the restraints which itself had imposed: but Sundays we keep in obedience to God's command: and though Christ has taught us, that the absolute rest, which the letter of that command seems to require, may be dispensed with in case of necessity, it is better to leave men to act as their conscience guides them, in applying this dispensation, than to tempt them to construe, as a case of necessity,

what they otherwise would not, by making it a general rule, that, in gathering in the harvest of the year, men should labour, though it be but after the service, on "the holy restful day." Such we may infer to have been the more deliberate judgment of our Church as to *labour* on this day, from the fact, that this part of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions has never been repeated. And the same nearly must be the case with respect to *amusements*, however innocent in themselves, and even if there were no danger that these would be abused.

In the reign of Charles I. when the Lord Chief Justice Richardson, on the Western Circuit, had given a charge against wakes and revels, on account of the evils that had arisen from them; and when, this charge having been censured, and the order made upon it countermanded by a higher power, a petition to the king on the subject had been prepared by the nobility and best gentry of the county of Somerset, it could not but be injurious to the Church, in the estimation of the people at large, that this petition also should have been prevented by the republication of the Book of Sports in the king's name: and the large share Archbishop Laud, then just elevated to the Primacy, bore in this transaction, must be set down to the account of the indiscreet acts of that truly great man. Scarce two years afterwards appeared, sanctioned by the influence of the Court, Heylyn's History of the Sabbath; the historical part of this subject, as his biographer tells us, having been referred to him, and the argumentative part to Dr. White, Bishop of Ely. The greater part

of Bishop White's book, indeed, though published this year, and dedicated to the Archbishop, is on a somewhat different subject, an answer to one Theoph. Braburne, who maintained that we are bound to keep the Sabbath on Saturdays: but certainly it is much to be regretted that, at such a time too, no greater pains to seek historical knowledge concerning the Lord's day should have been taken, than were bestowed on this hasty, ill-considered production of Dr. Heylyn. These are not the materials wherewith to help men form their opinions on a subject, which so comes home to the bosoms of all, as religion: and it is strange that they, under whose auspices the book came forth, should have fancied such obstructions, as they were raising, could stay the tide of popular opinion, which had already set strongly against them, and, chafed rather than checked by their resistance, soon overwhelmed them in its impetuous fury.

To teach that to play at bowls, or to make a feast on the Lord's day, is as great a sin as murder, was certainly most extravagant: yet they who maintained this untenable position, doubtless did so in a sincere desire that people should meditate on, and profit by, the solemn service of the day; which they, on the other hand, who asserted that people ought not to be discouraged in their harmless recreations, "as leaping, dancing, &c." after the close of divine service, would, to the Puritans at least, appear to care little whether that service produced a good impression or no. I remember, when I first went to the University, it was said a most distinguished individual, now no more,

used to be very unwilling to allow any of the junior members of his College to go to private balls, though in the very best families in the neighbourhood. Not that he thought dancing a sin: he was no Puritan: but he well knew how much such things are wont to occupy the minds of young men, both before and afterwards, and to unsettle and unfit them for their academical studies. Surely here was a deeper insight into human nature, than they possessed, who fancied people would attend with a suitable devotion to the sacred service of the Church, and thence rise up to join in idle merriment.

To those, indeed, who cannot read, and to those also who can, but find much reading to be foreign to their usual habits, Sunday evening, after the public service of the day is finished, may, perhaps, sometimes be found to hang heavily on their hands, as hours of sadness and not of joy. Is it to be said, then, that for them to seek relief in innocent amusements is a sin? While they do so with a consciousness that the day might be better employed, whatever evil there is in the practice will correct itself; but if they be taught that amusements, because harmless in their own nature, are therefore harmless to them, if entered into after the service is closed, the little benefit they will derive from religious impressions received in that service, only to be thus trifled away, will soon make them slight the Church service altogether, and regard amusement as the chief business of their holy day.

But Heylyn thinks, he has the authority of the ancient Church for Sunday amusements, and that in

Tertullian's time they did "devote the Sunday partly to mirth and recreation, not to devotion only." Whatever their rejoicing was, Tertullian does not describe it[1] as occupying a part only, but as forming the general character of the day. "Sunday we devote to gladness," diem Solis lætitiæ indulgemus;—"on that day our every thought is joy," die Solis lætitiam curamus. But, I suspect, the joy and gladness Tertullian spake of, were very different from what was in Heylyn's mind. It is not to be supposed, that they who on Sunday "put off even business, lest they should give place to the devil," would on that day expose themselves to his assaults by idle amusements. Theirs, no doubt, was a holy rejoicing, their joy was "joy before the Lord." To give up the day to feasting and to idleness, he intimates in one of the above passages, is the heathen's misapprehension of the nature of the Jewish Sabbaths, which, they thought, they had adopted. I do not, however, mean to say, either that it was the practice of Christians then, or that it is their duty now, to pass the whole day in prayer and devotional exercises alone: family parties, any decent meetings which have the character of family parties, and promote good-will amongst neighbours, seem well suited to the day, provided only there be nothing to destroy or disturb the good impression of its more serious duties.

As to other parties, which have not this character, and other profanations of the day, of which Bishop

[1] Apologet. Adv. Gentes. c. 16. Ad nationes L I. c. 13.

Horsley complains as growing up in his time, and which certainly have not diminished in ours; which having, if not their origin, their sanction, at least, in the careless practice of the higher orders, spread their demoralizing influence downwards, and threaten to banish from a large portion of the people all care for religion, if this tremendous evil receives no check from his eloquence, or the powerful remonstrances of others, his equals in station, it were vain for me to hope to oppose its progress: but I will say, that, whoever for one moment seriously considers the subject, must acknowledge, that those unnecessary, uncalled for entertainments, or amusements, or employments, which prevent masters of families, or *any part of their household*, from bearing a share in the sacred services of the Lord's day, cannot by any construction be reconciled with the duty of keeping that day holy; and no one can consider it a light matter to violate that duty, who considers it an obedience, not to a mere human law, but to the command of Him, who said, "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day."

But it may be said, this is a point on which our greatest divines, the master minds of our Church, have not themselves agreed. That their dissent may not have an undue influence in unsettling the sentiments of any one on so important a subject, it may be well to consider the course, which opinion has taken in this country; and in this consideration we may perhaps discover the cause of the dissent.

We have already seen, that at the era of the Reformation, the Roman Church had grounded the ob-

servance, not of Sundays alone, but of all holy days, on the fourth commandment, as being all alike appointed for Sabbath days by the authority of the Church; and that, of the Reformed Churches on the Continent, it was the followers of Calvin, who made the nearest approach to restore Sunday to its proper place in the Christian covenant. The first acknowledgement by our Church of Sunday, as properly the Sabbath of Christians, I conceive to be the Catechism of Edward VI., and the introduction of the Commandments into the Liturgy; but if it be denied, that the doctrine is there, and the first authoritative acknowledgement of it be said to be the Homily of the Place and Time of Prayer, written after the return of our divines from Geneva, be it so: the doctrine has no connexion with the peculiar tenets of Calvin which we reject, nor is the truth less acceptable, because it may have been pointed out by him or his followers. From this time, that Sunday is the day which God's immutable law binds us to keep holy, appears to have been generally received by those, who had formed their opinions before the Sabbatarians had attracted much notice: this doctrine is maintained by the judicious Hooker, by Bishops Andrews and Hall[1], and by one, who, as

[1] I know no work of Bishop Hall on this subject: but, in the first of his Sermons on the Impress of God, preached 1611, he says, "There is one day of the week, God's, κυριακὴ, Rev. i.; and yet, I would it were his; God's day by creation, by ordination, I would it were his by observation too." So again in his Epistles, Dec. VI. Ep. 1, to Lord Denny, speaking of God's day, he says, "The Sun of Righteousness arose upon it, and

he framed the Irish Articles of 1615, spake the sense of the Irish Church, Archbishop Usher. Dr. Bernard, his biographer, and the editor, if I mistake not, of his "Judgment on the Lord's day," writing forty years afterwards, tells us these Irish Articles, which expressly declare the morality of the Sabbath, were highly approved by the most orthodox divines: and he denies, what Heylyn asserts, that they were set aside in 1634; the second year, be it noted, of Laud's Primacy.

Archbishop Laud, indeed, was somewhat older than the two last of these distinguished Prelates: and I cannot but think his judgment, on this question, received a bias from his having early engaged in controversy, if not with Puritans, yet with those who leaned to that party: at least his protegè, Heylyn, regarded all consideration of the Lord's day as a Sabbath to be the badge of Puritanism.

That the Puritans, indeed, were anxious, that the Lord's day, and[1] not other days, should be kept holy, we know from the millenary petition; but as to the Lord's day, that "the Sabbath should not be profaned," was not their desire alone, but the unanimous desire of all at the Hampton Court Conference. Heylyn says, it was Dr. Reynolds, who on this occasion, spake of the "*profanation of the Sabbath:*" the expression[2] seems rather to be Bishop Barlow's, who drew up the account, and probably was used without

drew the strength of God's moral precept to it."—Hall's Works, Vol. I. London, 1634.

[1] Strype's Whitgift, B. IV. c. 31.

[2] Churchman's Remembrancer. Vol. I. p. 34. London 1807.

scruple by all in that assembly. Certainly the king's Proclamation, to which they referred, complains that "there had been great neglect in *keeping the Sabbath day*." Though the Lord's day is made the appropriate name, that of Sabbath also is used by the above mentioned divines. It seems to have been the language of the times. "It is an easy thing," says Lord Bacon [1], "to call for the observance of the Sabbath day; but what actions and works may be done on the Sabbath, and what not; to set this down, and clear the whole matter with good distinctions and decisions, is a matter of great knowledge and labour, and asketh much meditation and conversing in the Scriptures, and other helps, which God hath provided and preserved for instruction." To call the Lord's day the Sabbath, and to observe it as such, according to Christ's explanation of the duty, is no badge of Puritanism: the distinctive mark of that party, is the Judaical observance of the day, the insisting on a strict and absolute rest upon it, beyond what Christ taught us was really required even on the Sabbath days of the Jews.

Of the divines, who wrote before the Sabbatarian controversy made a noise in the world, Bishop Andrews most fully entered into the subject, commenting on the fourth commandment, in his "Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine," a work he himself never published: some few years, however, after his death, when Heylyn's book appeared, these treasures were brought

[1] Of Church Controversies, Bacon's Works, IV. p. 429.—London, 1730.

forward as an antidote to the poison. But Heylyn was neither the only, nor the ablest and most noted supporter of the side he espoused. Who were the advisers of the first publication of the Book of Sports, on the king's return from Scotland in 1618, is not known; but we know, Dr. Laud, then one of his Majesty's chaplains, had the honour of attending his Royal Master on that journey, and was three years afterwards made Bishop of St. David's. Heylyn says, there was no *Court Doctrine*, no *new Divinity* in this book of Sports, nothing more than James, when king of Scotland, had before expressed in his Basilicon Doron, published 1598. In that book, after saying, that for the promotion of friendship and heartliness, *certain days in the year should be appointed* for delighting the people with public spectacles of all honest games, and exercise of arms, and for honest feasting and merriness, King James adds, "I cannot see, what greater superstition can be in making plays and lawful games in May, and good cheer at Christmas, than in eating fish in Lent and on Fridays, the Papists as well using the one as the other: so that *always the Sabbaths be kept holy*, and no unlawful pastime used." Dr. Heylyn, somehow or other, seems to have thought this was a declaration, that lawful pastimes were to be used on *the Sabbaths:* what he thought of this word, in this place, does not appear: but we must remember, his biographer tells us he was only four months employed about his book.

It will readily be believed, that the opinion, which was adopted by the energetic mind of Laud, soon

found other kindred spirits to support it: accordingly at this time there rose up an host of men, who will ever be ranked among our ablest divines, and who all seem to have followed his course: Bishops [1] White, and [2] Bramhall, and Jeremy [3] Taylor, and [4] Sanderson, with Dr. [5] Hammond, and, though last, perhaps not least, Dr. [6] Barrow.

Let it not, however, be supposed that these great theologians encouraged a neglect of the Lord's day: not to pledge myself to every expression used in their writings on this subject (and that of Sanderson was but a private letter, never published by him, written to a person in Nottinghamshire, the very year after the second publication of the king's book of sports, to satisfy a case of conscience,) the practical rules they lay down, may be approved by all: the objection is not to their statement of the duty, but to their rejection of the ground, on which it truly rests. The Liturgy, indeed, constrained them to rest it in some sense on the fourth commandment: they say, therefore, the

[1] Treatise of the Sabbath day. London, 1636.

[2] The Controversies about the Sabbath and the Lord's day. Dublin, 1676.

[3] Ductor Dubitantium, B. II. c. 2, of the Jewish Sabbath, and the Lord's day p. 271. London, 1671. Or Life of Christ, Sect. XII. p. 25, p. 243. London, 1703.

[4] Eight Cases of Conscience. London, 1674. Case of the Sabbath.

[5] Practical Catechism, L. II. s. 12. Of fourth commandment. Hammond's Works, Vol. I. p. 61. London, 1684.

[6] Exposition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue. London, 1740.

day is to be kept, as required by the analogy, or the equity, or the reasonableness of that commandment; phrases, which in fact represent the commandment as being to us no *commandment* at all. Nay, Barrow, Sanderson, and Bramhall go so far as to say, that the Decalogue, being a covenant with the Jews, is not binding on Christians: and Bramhall thinks, he gathers this from our Lord's last words on the cross, "It is finished." The fourth commandment they all regard, not as giving a sanction to what had been appointed for the Patriarchs of old, but as a temporary ordinance, which ceased with the Jewish dispensation. Bramhall dwells at some length on the fact, that the Christian Fathers thought, no Sabbath was kept before the time of Moses; and, though Taylor admits a probability that the Patriarchs kept a Sabbath, yet he regards the creation but a temporary and transient reason for hallowing each seventh day, and maintains, as the others do, that to set apart *some stated times* for public worship, is the only perpetual and moral duty, under this head; and that the selection of each seventh day for this purpose, is to be referred only to the will of the Lawgiver. Sanderson holds, that the Lord's day was set apart as an holy day, not by the command of Christ or of his Apostles, but by the succeeding Church, in imitation of some of the Apostles, and in a desire to distinguish themselves from the Jews: Taylor, that the Apostles recommended this day by their own practice, but made no law about it, leaving the Church to her Christian liberty: White, with much force, argues the apostolical institution of

it from its immediate universal adoption; yet he maintains, with Bramhall and Hammond, that, though the Apostles *instituted* it as a weekly festival, they did not *substitute* it for the Jewish Sabbath. It is contended, indeed, by White, and Hammond, and Taylor, that there could have been no such substitution, because, forsooth, for many ages, Saturday was kept as well as Sunday in the Primitive Christian Church: and this they ground on the interpolated passage in Ignatius, on the Apostolical Constitutions, and on Asterius and Gregory of Nyssa, writers in the latter part of the fourth century.

If, indeed, the interpolated passage in Ignatius had been genuine, and the sixty-sixth Apostolical Canon, or the Apostolical Constitutions, had been really the work of Clement of Rome, their argument would have been unanswerable: but (honoured for ever be the name of Archbishop Usher!) the grounds on which it rests have been satisfactorily disproved. Such, at least, is my conviction. If any one knows any authority for the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths in the Christian Church, of an earlier date than the fourth century, (the very few, mentioned by Tertullian, who on Saturdays used the standing posture in prayer, and Montanist seceders from the Church evidently do not affect the question), to produce this authority will promote the cause of truth.

As we observe this agreement in deviation from the generally-received opinion, pervading the writings of such able divines, it is impossible not to think, that the extravagance of the Sabbatarians had some influ-

ence on their judgments; that they were unwilling to admit, that the Lord's day is to be kept in obedience to the fourth commandment, lest the admission should involve the necessity of keeping it according to the letter of that commandment. What else than prejudice on this subject can have been the cause, that one to whom Taylor[1] attributes the judiciousness of Hooker, the learning of Jewel, and the acuteness of Andrews, Archbishop Bramhall, pronouncing the arguments in favour of a Patriarchal Sabbath weak, should think he confirms his own view by alleging, that the sanctification of the seventh day, in Gen. ii. is, what God did himself, not what he commanded men to do? or, that the vigorous intellect of Jeremy Taylor should argue, that the Lord's day was not kept as a Sabbath, because, when St. Paul reproves the Corinthians for going to law before unbelievers, he does not reprove them for the profanation of this day; as if on it alone the Gentile courts of justice were open; and should regard the dispute, on what day the great anniversary of our Lord's resurrection should be kept, as a *demonstration*, that the weekly commemoration of it was not of divine or apostolical institution?

Something too must be ascribed to the influence of friendship, and the mutual interchange of thought, if we consider how they were all connected together. Bramhall went into Ireland with his patron, Lord Strafford; White was the friend, Taylor the chaplain,

[1] Sermon at the Funeral of John, Archbishop of Armagh, by Jeremy, Bishop of Down and Connor. London, 1672.

of Archbishop Laud, by whom also Sanderson was recommended to the royal favour; Hammond was the friend of Sanderson; and though Barrow was of a somewhat later day, in his early life distress, occasioned by the civil war, made him indebted for his education to the generosity of Dr. Hammond.

It is not a little remarkable, that though, in 1634, Sanderson so expressed himself as to convey the idea that no part of the Law, as delivered by Moses, not even the Ten Commandments, is binding on Christians, he[1] strongly urged the opposite doctrine, both in a Sermon, but two years before, and in his Lectures at

[1] In a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in 1632, Sanderson * says, "One distinction, well heeded and rightly applied, will clear the whole point concerning the *abrogation and abolition of the Moral Law* under the New Testament, and cut off many needless curiosities, which lead men into error. The Law, then, may be considered either as a *rule* or as a *covenant*. Christ hath freed all believers from *the rigour* and *curse* of the Law, considered as *a covenant:* but he hath not freed them from *obedience* to the Law, considered as *a rule*. And all those Scriptures that speak of the Law as if it were abrogated or annulled, take it considered as *a covenant;* those again that speak of the Law as if it were still in force, take it considered as *a rule*. The Law, as a *covenant*, is *rigorous;*—as *a rule*, is *equal*.—The Law, considered as a rule, can no more be abolished and changed than can the nature of *good* and *evil* be abolished or changed." Not to lengthen the extract, what can be spoken more admirably than all this? In 1634, however, he observes, "Every sober-minded Christian ought, without over-curious enquiry into those things that are more disputable, to believe

* Sanderson's Thirty-five Sermons. London, 1681, p. 298.

Oxford, in 1647. Can it be doubted what he thought most important to be maintained on the subject? Can

these few points following, viz. 1st. That no part of the Law delivered by Moses to the Jews doth bind Christians under the Gospel, as by virtue of that delivery; no, not the Ten Commandments themselves: but least of all the fourth, which all confess to be, at least in some part, ceremonial." In 1647, in the Divinity schools at Oxford *, he affirmed, "that the Moral Law, delivered by Moses, that is to say, the precepts of the Decalogue or the Ten Commandments, do oblige all Christians, as well as Jews, to the observation of them. All Protestants that I do know of, do with one mouth acknowledge this truth." He adds, however, a little of the leaven of 1634: "It will not be worth our labour to enquire, from whence it doth obtain that power to oblige: in my judgment, they speak to the purpose, who say, that this Law of Moses doth not oblige Christians formally, and as it is delivered by Moses, but only by reason of the matter, and as it is declarative of the law of Nature." Now, since all regard the Decalogue as a solemn sanction of our primary duties, because God with his own voice spake these words to his people, (Deut. v.), where is the use of commending or repeating the needless curiosity, the quibble, that they do not oblige us, because they were delivered by Moses to the Jews? Eight years afterwards, he censures the innovating Puritans † for demanding, "Where are to be found in Scripture your national Church? your infant sprinklings? Nay, where your metre Psalms? your two sacraments? your observing a weekly Sabbath? (for so far I find they are gone already). Shew us, say they, a command or example for them in Scripture." Different judgments may be formed from what Bishop Sanderson has here said; but to me it seems probable, that both he and Dr.

* Lectures on the Obligation of Conscience. London, 1660, p. 141.

† Sanderson's Twenty-one Sermons, preface. London, 1681.

it be doubted that this mode of representing our freedom from the law of Moses, was the doctrine of the new Primate? If the character of Sanderson be not sufficient to raise him above the suspicion of expressing any thing he did not truly believe, let it be remembered that he expressed this notion, that the Decalogue, as such, is not binding, only in a private, unpublished letter to an obscure individual, a Mr. Th. Sa. in Nottinghamshire: but the subject, no doubt, was much discussed among the friends of the Primate, before it was resolved to republish the Book of Sports, as a check to the growing evil of Sabbatism. Dr. Hammond's Practical Catechism was published about the year 1644. In his Commentary on the New Testament, written a few years afterwards, on John xx. 26, he observes, "The phrase, 'after eight days,' signifies after another week; that is, *as it seems*, on the first day of the week, as before, ver. 19." Is it too much to infer, from the doubtful expression, "as it seems," that a new light was then breaking forth on the mind of one who had before followed the interpretation of Dr. Heylyn? Both these instances seem to indicate, that the influence I have alluded to, had prevailed over the private judgment of the individual: to enter, how-

Hammond, as they advanced in life, altered their views on the *grounds* of the duty of keeping a Christian Sabbath: and though I am not warranted in making the same inference in the case of Dr. Barrow, (and he has well drawn up the *rule* of our duty for the day), I may be allowed to observe, that his opinions were not adopted by his distinguished friend and editor, Archbishop Tillotson.

ever, into minute criticism on their writings, would be foreign to my purpose.

Not, then, to urge again, that the judgment of these divines on the substitution of the Lord's day for the ancient Sabbath, was blinded by a reliance on documents now known to be spurious,—the chief point, to which all opponents of the doctrine of "the Homily, on the Place and Time of Prayer," ought to be held, is this; to call upon them to shew what authority there is for pronouncing the fourth commandment repealed. It might be expected, that a repeal of any of God's commands, would be as distinctly expressed as their first promulgation. Some of these divines, however, have thought they had discovered, that the whole Decalogue is laid aside. That this is not so, at least with respect to the second table of the commandments, is demonstrable from the Epistles of St. Paul; and there is no more reason to believe the repeal of the first table than of the second. Bishop Taylor, indeed, has maintained, that nothing more of the first table is obligatory on Christians, than is expressed in the great commandment, to love God; but let it be remembered, that when (to borrow his expression) "Christ [1] made this commandment to be Christian by adoption," it expressed the whole of the first table; for the whole was then indisputably binding. If this had not been so understood, would the Jewish scribe at once and readily have admitted the truth, that this is the first of all the commandments, and, on any other grounds,

[1] Life of Christ, Sect. xii. p. 6, 7.

unhesitatingly have placed this above the very words, which God's own voice had uttered on Sinai?

But, to come home to the question.—What proof can be brought that the fourth commandment, in particular, is laid aside? That we are not bound to the letter of the commandment, so as literally to do no manner of work, we are taught by the same authority that gave it. Christ has taught us, that works of mercy, works of necessity, nay, even in themselves, works of reasonable convenience, are no profanation of the Sabbath day. That we are not bound to rest at all on the last day of the week, nor to absolute rest on any day, as in itself a religious act, we are taught by his Apostle, St. Paul. But nothing more than this can be justly inferred from his declaration, that we are not to be judged in respect of *Sabbath days*. In the first ages of Christianity, the *Sabbath day* always signified the *last day of the week, or strict rest upon it*. The Jews made the rest to be the religion of the day: and that rest, not to look to the end for which it was ordained, was to them a shadow of the perfect rest from sin and sorrow in the world to come, of which faith in Christ is to us the very body, the very substance of the things hoped for: but if we look to the end for which this rest was ordained, to rest each seventh day from worldly business, in order that we may wholly devote ourselves to the business of religion,—this cannot in any sense be said to have been to the Jew a shadow of any thing, of which Christians have the substance. Under either covenant, this has been, and is the duty of all, as before either cove-

nant it was, from the very time God intimated it, in the hallowed close of the world's creation. It is true the Apostle censures the Galatians for observing days; but what he censures is, a Judaical observance of them, a regarding strict rest on them as a means of commending oneself to God: otherwise, the censure would be inconsistent with his doctrine, that to esteem one day holy rather than another, is a matter of indifference, in which every one is to be guided by his conscience: and what he thus represents in Rom. xiv. as a matter of indifference, is (as ver. 14. of the chapter intimates) regarding a day holy in itself, not in respect of its being kept holy by religious exercises: otherwise his doctrine would be inconsistent with the practice of the Church, to assemble together for the holy Communion on the Lord's day.

There is not, then, in the New Testament, any repeal of the fourth commandment, as it is our solemn remembrancer of the primeval sanctification of a seventh day. Nay, rather, as clearly as these lively Oracles tell us, that the last day of the week is no longer to be thus observed, so clearly they tell us also of another day, the first of the week, on which Christians came together for the public service of religion; a day to be marked above other days, as the Lord's day; a day, which we see from the sacred account, has been to us the birth-day of the new creation, the creation of the new spiritual order of things begun and finished in Christ; just as the former Sabbath was the birth-day of the old creation, the creation of the material world. The change of the once-appointed day having been

made or sanctioned by Christ himself, his day alone we, his people, are bound to keep; and there is nothing else in the command which is peculiar to the Jews, save only, that rest seems to have been enjoined to them as in itself a religious act: this, in the New Testament, is distinctly repealed: there is to be no Sabbatism now, as (and, I believe, Bishop Patrick truly [1] says, thus much alone the Christian Fathers did mean to declare) there was no Sabbatism in the patriarchal times: there is to be no fancying, as the Jews fancied, that the day is kept by strict rest alone, if unemployed in the services of religion. But still, the words of God speak to us, that we remember to keep holy our Sabbath day; that we remember, on its weekly return, to set ourselves free from the business of the world he has made, in order that, with one common consent of heart and mind, we all may devote ourselves wholly to the worship of him that made it.

To say there is no precept in the New Testament binding us thus to keep holy the Lord's day, is to raise an objection, which would come ill from any one, who desired to know, not to evade, the line of his duty to God. Whoever draws his opinions from an attentive study of the Scriptures, cannot fail to perceive, that in the Christian Church, as established by the Apostles, there is a regularly ordained ministry of bishops, priests, and of deacons, though the first of these orders be not there described by its present name: yet there is no precept, that none but those so

[1] Commentary on Gen. ii. 3.

ordained are to minister in the Church of Christ: in each of these cases, the reason for the omission of the precept seems to be the same, viz. that for the public matters of religion, no written rule is necessary: in these the practice of the Church is itself the record of the rule: and as in the case of the Christian priesthood, so in that of the Christian Sabbath also, the practice of the Church is satisfactorily proved. Whether we gather from [1] Austin, that the distinctive mark of the two covenants is, that in the Jewish the Sabbath was observed, which signifies our rest, in the Christian the Lord's day, which signifies our resurrection; whether we read in Athanasius, that Christ has transferred the Sabbath into the Lord's day, or in Origen, that even in the very mode of blessing the seventh day on the gift of manna, we may perceive a higher blessing intimated for the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection; or in Tertullian, that the Jewish Sabbaths are alien to us, who have each eighth day for our weekly festival; whether we find Clement of Alexandria, commenting on the fourth commandment and declaring, that the Lord's day is properly the seventh and the Sabbath, but that the seventh day has become the sixth and a working day; or Justin Martyr, after describing the Christian sacraments, and the Christian service on a Sunday, adding, that on that day Christ rising again and shewing himself to his

[1] Quindenarius numerus concordiam significat duûm Testamentorum; in illo enim observatur sabbatum, quod significat requietem; in isto dies Dominicus qui significat resurrectionem. August. Enarr. in Psalm cl.

Apostles and disciples, taught them these things; or we learn from the Epistle of Barnabas, that, because the Lord would not have his former Sabbaths, but those which he had made, we therefore keep festival the eighth day, the day on which Jesus rose again from the dead; or lastly, we see in the Scriptural denomination of the Lord's day, a distinct acknowledgment of it as the peculiarly holy day of the Lord our God; all antiquity, the earliest Fathers of the Church, and the sacred Canon itself bear witness as with one mouth, that the day on which Christ arose from the grave, has from the very times of the Apostles, ever been honoured above the seventh, and has ever been regarded as occupying, under the limitations above expressed, the same place in the Christian covenant, as the ancient Sabbath did in that of the Jews, being substituted for it as the Christian's weekly holyday: a day, therefore, to be kept holy by all Christians, in obedience to the fourth commandment.

On this foundation then, let us take our stand, nor listen to the sophistry, that would call us from the sacred ground. It seems strange, indeed, that they who would rest the duty of keeping the Lord's day, on the authority of the Church alone (meaning by this, not the authority of the inspired Apostles, which is no other than that of Christ himself,) do not themselves perceive, that if the general good sense of the community, did not supply what their doctrine omits, Sunday would soon come to be no better observed than other holydays, which are confessedly of human institution. That Sunday is to be kept holy according

to God's commandment, was the doctrine of our Church before it became obscured by the extravagance the Sabbatarians attempted to fasten on it: and this true doctrine again shone forth, when that dismal cloud had passed away. We find it asserted by Bishops [1] Pearson and [2] Hopkins, Archbishops [3] Tillotson and [4] Sharpe, Bishops [5] Burnet, and [6] Beveridge, and [7] Gastrell; to whom may be added the learned and pious author of [8] the Whole Duty of Man. The same doctrine we find too in the writings of laymen: besides that it is implied in the above quoted language of Lord Bacon, it is distinctly maintained by [9] Sir Henry Spelman; if not by Selden, yet by his friend and admirer, the Lord Chief Justice [10] Sir Matthew Hale; and by Robert Nelson, Esq. in his [11] Companion for the Festivals of the Church. At a later day this truth has been set forth in the [12] Lectures of one whose admirable judgment has

[1] Pearson on the Creed, Art. V. p. 397. Oxford, 1797.

[2] Exposition on the Commandments. 1669.

[3] Sermon XCIV. Vol. VI. p. 155. London, 1757.

[4] Sermons, Vol. IV. Serm. XII., XIII., XIV. London, 1754.

[5] On XXXIX Articles, Art. VII. p. 139. Oxford, 1805.

[6] Thesaurus Theol. on John xx. 26, Vol. II. p. 339. London, 1711.

[7] Christian Institutes, c. vi. p. 194, 195. London, 1707.

[8] Sunday II. Sect. 17. p. 18. London, 1703.

[9] Larger Work of Tythes, c. xxviii. 5. 2. Spelman's Works, I. p. 135. London, 1727.

[10] Directions for the Lord's Day, Hale's Contemplations, Vol. I. p. 427. Glasgow, 1763.

[11] Chap. i. on the Lord's Day,

[12] Lecture XXI. on the Fourth Commandment.

earned the veneration of posterity, Archbishop Secker; and it has, I believe, been generally received in our Church to the present times. Dr. Paley, however, in his Moral Philosophy[1] thought fit to raise his voice against the general consent: he allows, indeed, the Lord's day to be of divine appointment for public worship and religious instruction, but says, that to rest from work longer than we are attending on those assemblies, is a human regulation only. Such rest from labour that the public worship may be of profit to us, this at least must surely be required by the same authority, which requires the public worship. But that Paley took no pains to inform himself what had been said by the early writers of the Church, is evident from the proof that the primitive Christians reserved Sunday for religious meditation, which he thinks[2] he brings from Irenæus! Irenæus, or Ignatius, or neither of them, it was all the same to him: he never could have seen the passage, which really is taken from the Latin version[3] of the very interpolation of Ignatius' Epistle to the Magnesians, so often cited in proof of what it distinctly enjoins, viz. that the primitive Christians were so to keep Saturday. But whatever strength Dr. Paley might have thought there was in his reasonings, must, I should think, in the judgment of others, have sunk beneath the powerful argu-

[1] B. V. ch. 7. [2] Ibid. ch. 8.

[3] Sed unusquisque nostrûm Sabbatizet spiritualiter, meditationi legis congaudens, non corporis dimissione, fabricationem Dei admirans. Polycarpi et Ignatii Epist. Jac. Usserii. Oxon. 1644.—Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes. Lat. Vers. p. 57.

mentative eloquence of Bishop Horsley[1]; who grounding the duty of keeping the Christian Sabbath, on the primeval command to Adam, guards the doctrine against any objection which might be raised of similar obligation from the precept of blood given to Noah, by shewing the typical connexion of this last with the sacred blood of the Atonement. (Levit. xvii. 11.)

There remains, however, one other, and that a most important document to be considered; a document to which Dr. Hammond appeals in support of the view he has espoused in his Practical Catechism: I mean the Catechism of our Church. Though the fourth commandment is there recited, together with the rest of the Decalogue, yet it may be said, that in the summary of the first table no mention is made of special worship on any stated day, as a part of our duty to God. Now this omission (if such for a moment it may be called,) seems to set clearly before us the real truth of the case. It is our unquestionable duty, not as individuals only, but as the congregation of his people, to join together in worshipping God all the days of our life: hence, our Church has provided daily prayers, which she invites her members daily to use: but as the affairs of this world demand much time, and care, and labour, God was pleased in the old covenant to allow six days for this world's business and employments, and to require that each seventh day only should be kept holy for his especial service: the law of the Sabbath in this respect, was no *burden* imposed on the Jews,

[1] Horsley's Sermons, Serm. XXI., XXII., XXIII.

from which Christians are to be relieved; but was a *gracious boon given* to them, which Christians also are permitted to enjoy: the same portion of time only, as exclusively belonging to him, God now exacts from us; and if we hope for his blessing and guidance in the business and employments of the week, however regularly we may meet for prayers, as members of families every day, this same portion of time we must especially devote to his public service; and ever on its weekly return, enter his house with thanksgiving, and praise him in the great congregation. For, though in order that the holy fire may never go out, but be kept always burning on the altar of our hearts, we must cherish it every day, and continually offer up the sacrifice of our prayers to God, yet besides this continual offering, if we would truly walk after God's holy will and commandments, there must also be a special and a larger offering every seventh day.

THE END.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

NEW WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

I.

An ENQUIRY into the DOCTRINE of the ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH; in EIGHT SERMONS, preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1830, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. JOHN BAMPTON, M.A. Canon of Salisbury. By HENRY SOAMES, M.A. of Wadham College, Rector of Shelley, Essex, and Author of the History of the Reformation. 8vo. 13*s.*

II.

SERMONS on PRACTICAL SUBJECTS, preached at St. Michael's, St. Mary's, in Christ Church Cathedral, and in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin. By the late Very Rev. RICHARD GRAVES, D.D. Dean of Ardagh, Rector of St. Mary, and King's Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

III.

The LIFE of RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D. Master of Trinity College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. With an Account of his Writings, and Anecdotes of many distinguished Characters during the Period in which he flourished. By the Right Rev. JAMES HENRY MONK, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester. 4to. *Portrait.* 3*l.* 3*s.*

IV.

The GEOGRAPHICAL SYSTEM of HERODOTUS examined and explained by a Comparison with those of other Authors, and with Modern Geography. By JAMES RENNELL, Esq. F.R.S. Lond. and Edin. late Major of Engineers, and Surveyor-General in Bengal. New Edition, printed from the Author's revised Copy, and containing the Original Maps and Portrait, 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 8*s.*

V.

A REVIEW of the PRINCIPLES of NECESSARY and CONTINGENT TRUTH; in reference chiefly to the Doctrines of HUME and REID. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

VI.

The CHRISTIAN EXPOSITOR: or, Practical GUIDE to the READING of the NEW TESTAMENT. Intended for the use of General Readers. By the Rev. GEORGE HOLDEN, M.A. In one large Volume. 12mo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

"Though many Expositions of the Bible of great and deserved celebrity, exist in our language, a Commentary *sufficiently short* to be read by those who have not leisure to consult learned works, yet *sufficiently comprehensive* to serve as a guide to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, appears to be still wanting. To supply this deficiency, is the design of the present work, in which it has been the aim and study of the Author to embrace, in a condensed form, such information as will enable the general reader to ascertain the real meaning of the Inspired Writers."—*Preface.*

VII.

A NEW ANALYSIS of CHRONOLOGY and GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY and PROPHECY: in which their Elements are attempted to be explained, harmonized, and vindicated, upon Scriptural and Scientific Principles; tending to remove the Imperfection and Discordance of Preceding Systems, and to obviate the cavils of Sceptics, Jews, and Infidels. By the Rev. WILLIAM HALES, D.D. Rector of Killesandra, in Ireland; and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Dublin. Second Edition, Revised and Corrected. Four Vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 3*s.*

VIII.

SERMONS on some of the most INTERESTING SUBJECTS in THEOLOGY. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, M.A. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton. 8vo. 12*s.*

IX.

CHRISTIANITY ALWAYS PROGRESSIVE; being the Christian Advocate's Publication for the Year 1829. By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D. Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

X.

SERMONS on the HISTORY of our SAVIOUR. By the Rev. W. NORRIS, M.A. Rector of Warblington, Hants. 12mo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

XI.

PASTORALIA; or, a MANUAL of HELPS to the PAROCHIAL CLERGYMAN: containing a Scriptural View of the Clerical Duties—Scheme of Pastoral Visitation—Prayers for the Use of the Clergy—Outlines of Sermons—and a List of Books for the Clergy. By the Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, M.A. of St. John's College, Cambridge, Curate of Wrington, Somerset. In one large Volume, 12mo. 9*s.*

XII.

LECTURES on the ACTS of the APOSTLES, delivered in the Parish Church of Stockton-upon-Tees, during Lent, in the Years 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1806. By JOHN BREWSTER, M.A. Rector of Egglescliffe, in the County of Durham. Second Edition. 8vo. 14*s.*

XIII.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS on the ORDINATION SERVICES, for Deacons and Priests in the United Church of England and Ireland: for the Use of Candidates for Orders, and of those who renew their Ordination Vows. With appropriate Prayers for Clergymen, selected and original. By JOHN BREWSTER, M.A. New Edition. Small 8vo. 8s.

Date Due

NOV 20 '43			

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01003 2615